

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN

APR 2 1927

The Classical Journal

PUBLISHED BY THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH
WITH THE CO-OPERATION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND
AND THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC STATES

Volume XXII

APRIL, 1927

Number 7

Editorial: Charles H. Weller	481
Programs of the Southern Section and the New England Association	
The Influence of the Classics on English Literature	
Casper J. Kraemer, Jr.	485
The Biographical Interests of Nepos	Louis E. Lord 498
The Chronology of Caesar's Consulship	Frank Burr Marsh 504
An Ancient <i>Bon Vivant</i>	Arthur Patch McKinlay 525
Naukratia and Her Hinterland	E. Marion Smith 533
Notes	539
Walter Leaf	John A. Scott
Diodorus and Homer	John A. Scott
The Origin of the Myth of the Golden Fleece	John A. Scott
Current Events	542
Hints for Teachers	545
Book Reviews	549
<i>The Classics</i> , Lord Hewart (Smiley); <i>The Mind of Rome</i> , Cyril Bailey; <i>Readings from the Literature of Ancient Rome in English Translations</i> , Dora Pym (Spaeth); <i>The Week</i> , F. H. Colson (McCartney); <i>The Return of the Theban Exiles</i> , A. O. Prickard (Dorjahn).	
Recent Books	558

PRINTED AT
THE TORCH PRESS
CEDAR RAPIDS IOWA

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Published by the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, with the co-operation of the
Classical Association of New England and the Classical Association of the Pacific States

Editors-in-Chief

FRANK J. MILLER
The University of Chicago

ARTHUR T. WALKER
The University of Kansas

Editor for New England

JOSEPH W. HEWITT
Wesleyan University

Editor for the Pacific States

HERBERT C. NUTTING
The University of California

Associate Editors

GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

DANIEL W. LOTHMAN
East High School, Cleveland

VICTOR D. HILL
Ohio University

WALTER MILLER
The University of Missouri

JULIANNE A. ROLLER
Franklin High School, Portland, Ore.

GEORGE HOWE
University of North Carolina

BENJAMIN L. ULLMAN
University of Chicago

CLARENCE W. GLEASON
Roxbury Latin School, Boston

JOHN A. SCOTT
Northwestern University

WALTER A. EDWARDS
Los Angeles High School, Los Angeles

Business Manager

CHARLES H. WELLER
University of Iowa

Correspondence should be addressed as follows:

Concerning Manuscripts and Book Reviews, in general to Arthur T. Walker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. But manuscripts from the New England States should be sent to Joseph W. Hewitt, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut; from the Pacific States, to Herbert C. Nutting, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Concerning Special Departments, to those named at the head of each department.

Concerning Membership in the Associations:

In the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, to W. L. Carr, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. For the states included in this association, see the inside of the back cover.

In the Classical Association of New England, to Monroe N. Wetmore, Williams College, Williamstown, Massachusetts.

In the Classical Association of the Pacific States, to Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, Stockton, California. The states included in this association are California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Arizona.

Concerning Subscriptions (of those who are not members of one of the associations named above), to W. L. Carr, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Concerning Advertisements, to C. H. Weller, Business Manager, Iowa City, Iowa.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL is published monthly except in July, August, and September by The Torch Press, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. The subscription price is \$2.50 per year; the price of single copies is 30 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Bolivia, Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. For all other countries in the Postal Union, an extra charge of 25 cents is made on annual subscriptions (total \$2.75); on single copies 3 cents (total 33 cents).

The membership fee in each of the associations named above is \$2.00 a year, with the addition of 25 cents a year for Canadian members, for postage. This fee includes subscription to the JOURNAL at a special rate. See the back cover page.

Claims for Missing Numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Twenty-five Reprints are furnished free to the authors of major articles, book reviews, and notes. Additional reprints, if ordered in advance, are supplied at cost. Orders for additional reprints should accompany the corrected proof.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on October 16, 1923, and additional entry as second-class matter at Ann Arbor, Michigan, under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of Postage provided for in Section 1102, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 16, 1925.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME XXII

APRIL, 1927

NUMBER 7

Editorial

CHARLES H. WELLER

The casual reader of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL is not apt to think of the group of men who make each monthly issue possible, any more than is the traveller, peacefully resting in his Pullman berth, apt to think of the men who, on the engine and scattered through the train, are in charge of his journey and who ensure its ease and safety. Yet it is well to do so now and then, if only to render silent thanks for service; and when one who has long been a member of the JOURNAL staff lays down his task, when the familiar comrade is no longer felt marching by our side, it is greatly incumbent upon us that we do stop and remember.

After a brave fight against ill health for the past two years, Professor Weller died at his post at the University of Iowa, full of duties as of honors, on the third of March, and was laid to rest amidst the eulogies and profound regrets of his colleagues and his many friends. His full-rounded activities as classicist, archaeologist, journalist, administrator, were there recalled, and the empty place left by his departure realized.

But amidst all these activities he was of our own active body also. He has been knit up with our Association for many years, in many ways. He has been a member from the first, has been a familiar figure at our annual meetings, has served as president of the Association and as a member of the Executive Committee. But the most efficient and prolonged service which he has rendered has been that of business manager of the JOURNAL,

to the duties of which he was officially appointed in 1922. We shall miss his efficient and unselfish service, his wise counsel, and, most of all, his genial and inspiring presence when we come together annually to touch elbows again and to renew old friendships, which have been growing more and more to be cherished as the years have passed.

We mourn his loss. We salute our departed comrade. *Lamenta ac lacrimas cito, dolorem et tristitiam tarde ponemus.*

SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOUTHERN SECTION OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH,

AT WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY,

LEXINGTON, VIRGINIA, APRIL 28-30, 1927

All meetings except the dinner on Friday night will be held in the Lee Memorial Chapel.

THURSDAY, 8:30 P. M.

- C. E. LITTLE, Peabody College: "The Traditions of the Scipio Family."
 E. MARION SMITH, Hollins College: "The Egypt of the Greek Romances."
 B. A. WOOTEN, Washington and Lee University: "The Scientist and the Classics."
 HUBERT M. POTEAT, Wake Forest College: "Some Ancient Manifestations of the Religious Impulse."

FRIDAY, 9:00 A. M.

- MARIE B. DENNEEN, North Carolina College for Women: "The Practical Value of Latin for English."
 G. A. HARRER, University of North Carolina: "Some Verses of Cicero."
 CATHERINE TORRANCE, Agnes Scott College: "Virgil's Art as Shown in the Naming of his Warriors."
 D. C. PEACOCK, Peacock School, Atlanta: "An Effort to Clarify Some Conceptions of the Latin Subjunctive."
 ELEANOR OSBORNE, The Tutoring School, Norfolk: "Teaching the Beauty of the *Aeneid*."
 THOMAS FITZHUGH, University of Virginia: "The Indo-European Voice of Triumph."

FRIDAY, 1 P. M.

University Assembly at which there will be an address by GORDON J. LAING, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Chicago.

FRIDAY, 3:30 P. M.

R. B. STEELE, Vanderbilt University: "The Growth of *Aeneid* i-vi."

LOUISE WEISIGER, John Marshall High School, Richmond: "Painting the Background."

GEORGE HOWE, University of North Carolina: "The Outbreak of War in the Seventh *Aeneid*."

FRIDAY, 4:30 P. M.

Automobile ride to Natural Bridge or Goshen Pass.

FRIDAY, 8:00 P. M.

Washington and Lee will entertain the members of the Association at dinner.

Following the dinner there will be:

Address of Welcome: President HENRY LOUIS SMITH.

Response for the Association: Professor GEORGE HOWE.

Address by Dean LAING.

SATURDAY, 9:00 A. M.

Business Session: Election of Officers.

DONNIS MARTIN, Winthrop College: "The Compound Verb as an Aid in Developing English and Latin Vocabulary."

E. L. GREEN, University of South Carolina: "The Battle of Navarino."

RUTH CARROLL, Hartsville High School, S. C.: "Latin Clubs."

ELIZABETH BROWN, Randolph-Macon Woman's College: "The American Academy in Rome."

R. R. ROSBOROUGH, Duke University: "Some Errors in Suetonius' Life of Caligula."

C. R. HARDING, Davidson College: "The Aorist Participle of Subsequent Action."

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION
OF NEW ENGLAND AT HOLY CROSS COLLEGE,
WORCESTER, MASS., APRIL 22-23, 1927

FRIDAY, 10:00 A. M.

Address of Welcome by President JOSEPH N. DINAND, S. J., Holy Cross College. Response by Professor JULIA H. CAVERNO, President of the Association.

EUNICE WORK, Wheaton College: "Latin Textbooks of the Past."

FRANCIS X. DOWNEY, S. J., Holy Cross College: "This Problem of Work."

Reports and business, including the election of officers.

FRIDAY, 2:00 P. M.

LEWIS B. PATON, Hartford Theological Seminary: "Graeco-Roman Remains in Syria" (Illustrated).

EDITH FRANCES CLAFLIN, Rosemary Hall: "Reading from Horace, Catullus, and Sappho."

BERNARD M. ALLEN, Roxbury School: "A Horrible Example."

MRS. LLOYD H. BUGBEE, West Hartford: "An Exploratory Course in General Language."

A Round Table. For the discussion of problems concerning Greek in schools and colleges. Miss CAVERNO will preside and Professor CHARLES D. ADAMS will open the discussion.

FRIDAY, 8:00 P. M.

The Episodes of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* in English Version will be presented by the Greek Academy of Holy Cross College.

SATURDAY, 9:30 A. M.

PHILIP B. WHITEHEAD, University of Vermont: "Some New Facts regarding the Caesura in Latin Hexameter" (Illustrated).

RUTH WITHERSTINE, Smith College: "A Study of the Cento."

RUSSEL M. GEER, Brown University: "On the Theories of Dream Interpretation in Artemidorus."

MARY V. BRAGINTON, Mount Holyoke College: "Some Aspects of the Supernatural in the Tragedies of Seneca."

GEORGE L. HENDRICKSON, Yale University: "Persius."

SATURDAY, 2:00 P. M.

MARION B. REID, Miss Hall's School: "A Book Review."

CHARLES H. FORBES, Phillips Academy, Andover: "Vergil's 'Bevie of Ladies Bright'."

Unfinished business.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CLASSICS ON ENGLISH LITERATURE

By CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.
Washington Square College
New York University

The chart which forms the basis of the present paper was drafted in a much simpler form for the use of students¹ interested in English literature and especially in the influence exerted upon English literature by the classics. I have thought that it might, in an extended form, be interesting also to teachers of Latin and Greek as well as of English, as a means of demonstrating the continued influence of Latin and Greek upon English literature.

It was necessary to make clear repeatedly to the students, and perhaps it may not be amiss to say in a word here, that the phrase "influence of the classics on English literature" implies neither the superiority of the classical authors nor any lack of originality in English literature. "Originality" must sharply be distinguished from "novelty," and the interest of a writer in classical literature need affect his creative activity no more adversely than does his interest in science, art, religion, or politics. To the student of history it is of prime importance to know the interests of men in any given period; to the student of comparative literature it is equally valuable to know the literary interests of authors, to trace the source of these interests, and to note the change from period to period. Thus a "history of the influence of the classics" is in reality a chronological study of *interest* of literary artists in the work of their Latin and Greek predecessors. Such a history has, so far as I know, not yet been written. It is necessarily different from a history of scholarship, such as that for instance of Sandys,

¹ In a course in the Influence of the Classics given jointly by the author and two of his colleagues in the Washington Square College, Professor Homer A. Watt and Dean James B. Munn, both in the Department of English.

in that it traces the interest not of scholars or professional students of the classics, but of literary men, creative artists who found in the Greek and Latin classics sources of inspiration or models for technique. Of the difficulty of writing such a history I am of course perfectly aware. The enormous mass of material to be covered by one who would wish to summarize the classical influence on English literature, and the difficulty of forming reasonably accurate judgments not only on each period but also on the extent of the influence upon any given man, requires an extensive and intimate command of English literature to which it would be folly for a student of Latin and Greek to lay claim. Finally, the problem of estimating contemporary tendencies and of determining the genuine influence of Latin or Greek upon writers of the present day requires a more critical and balanced point of view than mine.

Despite all this, however, I have determined to publish the following chart not only for what practical value it may have but also for the purpose of calling attention to the need of a history of classical influence which will be extensive, thorough, and authoritative. In accordance with this frankly didactic purpose I have sedulously avoided footnotes. The material comes from a wide range of sources, primary and secondary, and a complete set of references would be too cumbersome. A few comments which seemed to me useful to the reader but difficult to incorporate in the scheme I have accordingly appended as notes.

With all its imperfections the chart will show, I think, a number of very interesting facts. For instance, the change in the knowledge of Greek has been much less marked from the earliest period to the present day than is generally understood. The popular impression at the present moment that Greek is practically dead would seem not to be borne out by the facts. In the earliest period of English literature Greek was practically unknown; in its period of greatest influence it never attained the popularity of Latin, and the present decline in interest, if there really be a decline, is not so definite as is generally assumed. What is of more striking importance is the change of interest in Latin.

From the Middle Ages until the opening of the nineteenth century it appears that the influence in England was continuous and in certain periods overwhelming, but that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the interest seems to have been superseded among literary men by the still stronger interest in Greek.

A second fact of importance to be noted is the change of interest in certain of the authors. The remarkable difference of taste between the Anglo-Saxon period, with its emphasis upon such writers as Boethius, Orosius, "Cato," Valerius Maximus, and Pliny the Elder, and the modern period, with its increasing interest in such writers as Lucretius and Catullus, is most striking and perhaps not sufficiently stressed. Even the interest in Terence, continuous as it seems to have been, has changed in character: whereas formerly his plays were appreciated as those of a moralist, we now value them as those of an artistic literary workman. The history of the interest in Ovid also is striking, leading as it does through imitation in the fifteenth century, enormous popularity in the sixteenth, and almost total neglect in the nineteenth and twentieth. So too the relative apathy toward Vergil and Horace is all the more interesting when one considers the popularity of these writers in preceding periods. Again I may point out how the interest in Terence in the Middle Ages and in the Anglo-Saxon period changes to an interest in Plautus in the Elizabethan and reverts once more to the interest in Terence after the Restoration and at the present moment.

In the third place the chart offers an excellent illustration of a fact already well known, that is, the enormously wide classical basis of Elizabethan literature. The best answer to the charge that classical influence involves a loss of originality is that in this most original of all the periods of English literature the representative writers are so thoroughly steeped in classical lore, mythology, and style.

Finally, some slight parallels may be drawn between the phenomenon in the Revival of Learning and that in the present period, where a renewed interest in classics has arisen from the discovery of new texts of classical authors and the resultant re-

awakening of interest in classical civilization. It is too much to say that the modern period is another Renaissance, but certainly some of the chief characteristics, notably the interest in Greek, are common to the two periods.

TABLE TO ILLUSTRATE
THE INTEREST IN GREEK AND LATIN DURING CHIEF PERIODS OF ENGLISH
LITERATURE

I. ANGLO-SAXON PERIOD

TYPICAL AUTHORS	LATIN	GREEK
Aldhelm (d. 709) Bede (673-745) Alfred (849-901) Chronicles (9th and 10th centuries)	Little knowledge of important classical Latin authors excepting Terence . ¹ Vergil the magician. Some acquaintance with late or inferior Latin authors (e.g., Boethius , Orosius). Cato's Distichs popular textbook from eighth century to eighteenth. Valerius Maximus , Statius , and Lucan popular during Middle Ages. Pliny the Elder widely used as scientific manual (Bede, Alcuin) and storehouse of general information.	Greek practically unknown. ²

¹ The notes to which such numbers refer will be found on the last page of the article.

II. MIDDLE ENGLISH PERIOD

TYPICAL AUTHORS	LATIN	GREEK
Geoffrey of Monmouth (ca. 1137)	Some influence of Latin comedy on farce interludes, plays of domestic intrigue, and Saints' plays (12th-13th cent.). Romances on classical and pseudo-classical themes (chiefly 11th-13th centuries): Apollonius of Tyre, Romance of Troy, Romance of Thebes, Alexander Cycle. Considerable interest in Frontinus (John of Salisbury). Some knowledge of minor rhetorical works of Cicero (Bacon). No historical perspective. Beginning of vogue of Ovid , with extensive imitations by Chaucer and Gower and translation by Caxton, 1480. Considerable use of Vergil . Some knowledge of Lucan and Statius (Chaucer). Seneca's philosophical works much quoted. Beginning of translations (Gavin Douglas' <i>Vergil</i> , 1553).	No direct knowledge of Greek.
Geraldus Cambrensis (ca. 1146-1220)		Translation of Aristotle into Arabic (by Averrhoes). The retranslation into Latin widely read.
Walter Mapes (ca. 1200)		"Aristotelian authority" the doctrine of the Schoolmen. Reaction under Bacon.
The "Schoolmen" (1200-1300):		Slight knowledge of Plato (in Latin).
Abelard (1079-1142)		
John of Salisbury (ca. 1115-1180)		
Duns Scotus (ca. 1265-1308)		
Robert Grosseteste (ca. 1175-1253)		
Roger Bacon (ca. 1214-ca. 1294)		
Gower (ca. 1325-1408)		
Chaucer (ca. 1340-1400)		
Caxton (ca. 1422-1491)		

III. REVIVAL OF LEARNING³

TYPICAL AUTHORS	LATIN	GREEK
<p>Oxford Humanists: Grocyn (1446-1519) Linacre (1460-1524) Erasmus (1465-1536) Colet (1466-1519) Lilye (ca. 1468-1522) More (ca. 1478-1535) Elyot (ca. 1490-1546) Udall (1504-1556) Buchanan (1506-1582) Ascham (1515-1568) Howard (1517-1547) Gascoigne (ca. 1525-1577) Sackville (1536-1608) Early comedies (e.g., <i>Thersites</i>, 1537) and tragedies (e.g., <i>Gorboduc</i>, 1562; <i>Jocasta</i>, 1569)</p>	<p>Recovery of ancient MSS. Latin classical authors revived and read widely but without discrimination. Predominant influence of Italian humanists (Petrarch, 1304-1374; Boccaccio, 1313-1375 *). Universal appeal of Ovid. Cicero a model of style. Effects of the "Ciceronian controversy" felt in England (Sidney). The reaction (Erasmus, Bacon). Considerable influence on "English School Drama": "Mirth" plays modeled on Plautus, "Prodigal Son" plays on Terence. Senecan influence on early tragedy (<i>Gorboduc</i>, <i>Tancred and Gismunda</i>, <i>Misfortunes of Arthur</i>). Impulse to early comedy by humanists' study of Vitruvius and Roman stage technique.</p>	<p>Beginning of serious study of Greek (especially at Oxford) under Italian influence. Beginning of translations (Elyot). University interest in drama: performances of Aristophanes' <i>Plutus</i> (1536), <i>Peace</i> (ca. 1546).</p>

IV. ELIZABETHAN PERIOD

TYPICAL AUTHORS	LATIN	GREEK
<p>Translators:</p> <p>Surrey (Vergil, 1557) Phaer (Vergil, 1558-1562) Golding (Ovid, 1565-1575) Adlington (Apuleius, 1566) Underdowne (Heliodorus, 1569) North (Plutarch, 1579) Heywood (Seneca, 1581) Hall (Homer, 1581) Savile (Tacitus, 1591) Marlowe (Ovid, <i>Amores</i>, 1597; Lucan, 1600) Chapman (Homer, 1598-1616; Hesiod, 1618) Holland (Livy, 1600; Pliny the Elder, 1601) College plays: <i>Dido</i>, 1553; <i>Bellum Grammaticale</i>, 1581; <i>Pilgrimage to Parnassus</i>, 1598 Wyatt (1503?-1542) Tusser (ca. 1524-1580) Hooker (1553-1600) Lyly (1553-1606) Spenser (ca. 1553-1599) Sidney (1554-1586) Kyd (1556-ca. 1595) Peele (1558-1597) Chapman (1559-1634) Greene (1560?-1592) Bacon (1561-1626) Drayton (1563-1631) Shakespeare (1564-1616) Jonson (ca. 1572-1637) Donne (1573-1631) Hall (1574-1656) Th. Heywood (ca. 1575-ca. 1650) Shirley (1596-1666) Puttenham (d. 1590)</p>	<p>Latin classics widely read. Ovid still most popular poet (e.g., use in schools and as source for subjects of painters). Beginning of popularizing with translations (N.B. Queen Elizabeth's Englishings of Boethius, Plutarch, and Horace). Latinized style (Hooker). Experiments in classical meters (Spenser). Amorous mythological tale, after Ovid (Shakespeare, Marlowe, Drayton). Classical learning expressed in quotations and use of classical themes (Jonson, Lyly). Beginning of vogue of classical satire (Wyatt, Hall, Lodge, Marston). Interest in personality of classical authors (Jonson, <i>Poetaster</i>; Cokain, <i>Tragedy of Ovid</i>). Growth of didactic poetry (Tusser, Googe, Daniel). Beginning of epigram under classical influence (Jonson). Development of literary criticism, chiefly under influence of Horace (Sidney, Wilson, Puttenham). Some influence of Latin elegy on Elizabethan lyric. Pliny the Elder source of much of the fantastic natural history of the Euphuists. "Blood and thunder" Senecan tragedy (Kyd and Peele). General enthusiasm for moralizing of Seneca (Jonson, Daniel, Lodge).</p>	<p>Height of influence of Italian humanism on England: "Italianation." Interest in philosophy strong (e.g., Spenser's use of Aristotle and Plato, Bacon's Anti-Aristotelianism). Interest in the Ideal Commonwealth (Plato, <i>Republic</i>; More, <i>Utopia</i>; Bacon, <i>New Atlantis</i>). Some knowledge of the Greek anthology (Milton). Influence of Theocritus on pastoral (Googe, Spenser). Influence of Greek romances on prose fiction, both through Italian (Lyly) and directly (Sidney, Greene). Plutarch (in Latin or English) favorite moralist and biographer (Bacon, Shakespeare, Walton). Beginning of vogue, under French influence, of the Pindaric ode (Jonson, Spenser).</p>

TYPICAL AUTHORS	LATIN	GREEK
	<p>Bacon's <i>Essays</i> inspired by Seneca's Letters. Plautine influence strong (Heywood, Shakespere, Jonson); Terence neglected. Beginning of vogue of Horace as satirist (Jonson) and critic (Sidney). Tacitus frequently quoted (Bacon); reflection of wide interest on continent. Vogue of pastoral: eclogues (Googe); drama (Fletcher, Shakespere, Lyly); fiction (Sidney, Lodge, Greene); epic (Spenser); lyric (Lodge, Breton, Campion). Interest in Cicero still strong. Many translations, 1555-1576.</p>	

V. SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

TYPICAL AUTHORS	LATIN	GREEK
Overbury (1581-1613) <i>Characters</i> (1614)	Latin universally known by men of letters.	Greek well known. Italian influence still strong (e.g., literary criticism derived not from original study of Aristotle , but through Italians).
Herbert (1583-1633)	Continued popularity of Ovid and Vergil (Milton).	Imitation of Pindar (Cowley, Dryden).
Hobbes (1588-1679)	Period of classical erudition (under French influence; Budaeus and Scaliger).	Homer and Hesiod among chief classical sources of Milton.
Herrick (1591-1633)	Neo-classical movement led by Dryden (2nd half of century).	
Earle (1601?-1665) <i>Microcosmographie</i> , 1629	Latin used as linguistic medium of science, learning, and diplomacy: Milton (1608-1674), Ray (1627-1705), Newton (1642-1727), Leibnitz (1646-1705).	
Milton (1608-1674) <i>Paradise Lost</i> , 1667; <i>Samson Agonistes</i> , 1671	Dramatic influence strong but derived through French.	
Cowley (1618-1667)	Discussion of the art of translation (Roscommon).	
Roscommon (ca. 1630-1685)	Use of Horace and Catullus by writers of lyric and occasional verse (Suckling, Herrick, Lovelace).	
Restoration dramatists: Sedley , <i>Bellamira</i> (1687)	Didactic poetry popular, especially versified rhetoric (Sheffield, Roscommon) and criticism (Dryden).	
Wilson , <i>Projectors</i> (ca. 1665)		
Shadwell , <i>Squire of Alsatia</i> (1688)		
Dryden , <i>Mistaken Husband</i> (1675), <i>Amphitryon</i> (1690)		
Dryden (1631-1700)		

VI. EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

TYPICAL AUTHORS	LATIN	GREEK
Dennis (1657-1734) Swift (1667-1745) Toland (1670-1722) Shaftesbury (1671-1713) Addison (1672-1719) Philips (1676-1708) Bolingbroke (1678-1751) Gay (1685-1732) Pope (1688-1744) Fielding (1707-1754) Johnson (1709-1784) Hume (1711-1776) Gray (1716-1771) Burke (1729-1797) Cowper (1731-1800) Gibbon (1737-1794)	<p>Neo-classical movement led by Pope (1st half of century), Johnson (2nd half).</p> <p>Revival under French influence of Elizabethan interest in classical satire (Pope).</p> <p>Influence of Cicero on the Deists or Rationalists (Herbert, Shaftesbury, Toland, Hume) and on orators (Burke).</p> <p>Widespread influence of Roman satirists Horace, Persius, and Juvenal (Johnson).</p> <p>Interest of philosophers in Seneca (Bolingbroke).</p> <p>Crystallization of dramatic "rules" (e. g., Unities).</p> <p>Influence on comedy of Terence: Steele, <i>Conscious Lovers</i> (1722), Cooke, <i>Eunuch</i> (1737), Bellamy, <i>Perjured Devotee</i> (1741); and, to a less extent, of Plautus: Fielding, <i>The Miser</i> (1733).</p> <p>Height of interest in Horace: lyrics (Prior), criticism (Pope), quotations (Addison, Steele), philosophy (Chesterfield).</p> <p>The controversy of the Ancients and the Moderns (Temple, Wotton, Swift).</p> <p>Height of didactic poetry: philosophy and criticism (Pope), industry (Philips, Gay, Dyer, Grainger), description (Thomson, Cowper).</p> <p>Wide general acquaintance with Latin authors (Gibbon, Johnson).</p> <p>Decadence of pastoral (Pope, Gay).</p>	<p>Increasing philological and antiquarian knowledge of Greek authors (Bentley).</p> <p>French influence now strong especially in criticism (Boileau) and drama (Corneille) derived through Horace from Greeks.</p> <p>Some imitation of Lucian (Swift, Fielding).</p> <p>Some direct influence from Aristophanes (Dennis).</p>

VII. NINETEENTH CENTURY

TYPICAL AUTHORS	LATIN	GREEK
Wordsworth (1770-1850) Coleridge (1772-1834) Landor (1775-1864) De Quincey (1785-1859) Byron (1788-1824) Shelley (1792-1822) Keats (1795-1821) Carlyle (1795-1881) Macaulay (1800-1859) Newman (1801-1890) Fitzgerald (1809-1883) Tennyson (1809-1892) Thackeray (1811-1863) Browning (1812-1889) Arnold (1822-1888) Patmore (1823-1896) Morris (1834-1896) Swinburne (1837-1909) Pater (1839-1894)	<p>Strong and discriminating interest.</p> <p>In first half of century a widespread and rather curious classical movement in very center of English Romantic school, resulting in revulsion against Latin in favor of Greek.</p> <p>Scientific "higher criticism" and editing of classical texts.</p> <p>Decline of vogue of Horace to mere fondness for quotation (e.g., Thackeray).</p> <p>Revival of interest in Lucretius, due to current materialistic and Epicurean thought (Fitzgerald, Tennyson).</p> <p>Continuous experiments in adapting classical meters to English verse (Southey, Clough, Kingsley, Browning, Tennyson, Swinburne).</p> <p>Latin still used, though very rarely, as linguistic medium (Cobet).</p> <p>Decline of interest in Ovid (due to current apathy toward mythology).</p>	<p>Greek influence more powerful than in any period preceding. Derived partly through Germans (e.g., Goethe, Schiller, Lessing) but mostly from original (e.g., Coleridge, Wordsworth).</p> <p>Aesthetic criticism and emulation of Greek style.</p> <p>Romantic and sentimental attachment to Greece (Byron).</p> <p>Imitation of Greek lyric forms, especially ode (Shelley, Patmore, Swinburne).</p> <p>Intensive study of the criticism of Aristotle and Longinus.</p> <p>Interest in the Greek dramatists strong (the Brownings, Fitzgerald, Shelley).</p> <p>Some interest in Greek pastoral poets (Shelley, Wordsworth).</p>

VIII. LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND CONTEMPORARY

TYPICAL AUTHORS	LATIN	GREEK
Andrew Lang (1844-1912) Eugene Field (1850-1895) A. E. Housman (1859-) Maurice Hewlett (1861-1923) Rudyard Kipling (1865-) Richard Le Gallienne (1866-) Walter de la Mare (1873-) Amy Lowell (1874-1925) Upton Sinclair ⁵ (1878-) James Branch Cabell (1879-) The "colyumists": F. P. Adams (1881-) Christopher Morley (1890-) Sara Teasdale (1884-) Ezra Pound (1885-) Louis Untermeyer (1885-) Conrad Aiken (1889-) Richard Aldington (1892-)	Latin used widely for quotation and reference but reaction in favor of Greek still dominant among literary men. Interest in authors of more exclusively literary appeal: Catullus, Terence, Lucretius. Horace still a traditional favorite for quotation and reference (F. P. A., editorials, critical literature, etc.).	Greek literary influence powerful. Prevalence of sympathetic interpretation, especially in drama and criticism. Widespread interest in history and antiquities as result of archaeological excavations. Discovery of new texts of classical authors (Aristotle, Sappho, Menander, Herodas , etc.) on papyrus. Popularity of translations (Murray's <i>Euripides</i> , Loeb Classical Library), handbooks, and summaries of classical culture.

NOTES

1. My colleague Dr. Walter MacKellar writes me as follows: "It is not possible to speak with absolute certainty, but there are here and there in Old English poetry, e. g., that of Cynewulf, what seem to be evidences of a knowledge of Vergil. Some Old English scholars believe it might even be worth while to make a thorough search through Old English literature to determine the Vergilian influence there."

2. This comment needs a word of explanation. The study of Greek in Italy underwent a steady decline during the 5th and 6th centuries and by the year 690 was practically extinct. In Gaul (France) the interest in Greek was fostered, as is well known, by the activities of the traveling Irish monks Columban (543-615) and Gallus, founder of the monastery of St. Gall (d. 640). The notable revival of interest under Charlemagne is exemplified by Erigena (John the Scot, ca. 800-ca. 877), who knew in the original the Church Fathers, the Neoplatonists, and some of Aristotle. The interest however was not lasting, and here too the study of Greek declined (ca. 900-1100). In England schools for the study of Latin and Greek were founded by Theodore of Tarsus (d. 690).

It should be noted that, strictly speaking, all this has little to do with the present subject. On the *literature* of this period, in England, Greek seems to have had almost no influence, although A. S. Cook has recently attempted to show a connection between *Beowulf* and the *Odyssey* ("Greek Parallels to Certain Features of the *Beowulf*," *Philological Quarterly*, V (1926), 226-234).

3. The so-called Revival of Learning in England can be understood more clearly if one remembers the achievements of the movement in Italy (ca. 1350-1525). Briefly summarized, the chief characteristics of the period were the following:

- a) A widespread and enthusiastic search for classical manuscripts (Petrarch, 1304-1374; Poggio, 1380-1459; Lascaris, ca. 1445-1535).
- b) The rapid development of the newly discovered art of printing (Aldus Manutius) and the appearance of many first editions of classical authors (Homer, 1488).
- c) The study of Greek by *literary* men (Boccaccio, 1313-1375; Politian, 1454-1494).
- d) Popularity of translations from the classics (Bruni, d. 1444).
- e) Imitation of the style of Cicero and Vergil (Petrarch, 1304-1374; Barzizza, 1370-1431).
- f) Beginning of popularity of Ovid as source of classical mythology for painting and poetry.
- g) Educational systems built on classics (Vegio, d. 1458; Piccolomini, 1405-1464).
- h) Much interest in the evaluation of new-found classical authors. Growth of literary criticism under influence of Aristotle and Horace.

The Revival in Italy and the consequent interest in Greek came to an end about 1525, after giving impetus to the movement in England.

4. To Petrarch's influence is to be ascribed, among other things, the increased interest in Cicero and Plato. Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum* may be cited here for its importance as a dictionary of classical mythology.

5. The inclusion in this list of Upton Sinclair is not without a slight touch of malice. Few people will be surprised more than Mr. Sinclair himself to find his name among the great number of those who are indebted to antiquity and who to that extent at least look backward rather than forward. Yet his latest book *Mammonart* deals confidently with the problems of Greece and Rome and gives on pp. 65-68 an admirable instance of the "influence of" or "interest in" a classical author — significantly Juvenal.

THE BIOGRAPHICAL INTERESTS OF NEPOS

By LOUIS E. LORD
Oberlin College

In a charming article published in the *Yale Review* for October, 1921, entitled "From Plutarch to Strachey," Mr. Wilber Cross says:

The modern love for biography, intense as it now is, is no new thing. Some one will perhaps some day write a little treatise and call it "The Development of Biography," after the manner of similar books on the drama and the novel designed for college classes in literature and for those women's clubs that consume whole editions of such handbooks. That man (or woman) who perhaps is living somewhere even now, may try to show how biography, like fiction, disengaged itself from history of the kind Herodotus wrote; but if he is wise he will come quickly to those wonderful parallel lives by Plutarch, some of which I have just read in the late Professor Perin's exact and beautiful English. If he be a Dr. Dryasdust he will dwell on the fact that the Greek biographer gives few dates for the events which he describes and that there are no footnotes telling how the anecdotes concerning Caesar and Alcibiades or the rest can be run down to their sources — but Dr. Dryasdust, even though he may lament that he has no field here for the exercise of his gifts, will hardly fail to see how perfect is the art and workmanship within those limits that Plutarch sets for himself.

I have no intention of trying to satisfy the clamorous desire of these women's clubs for a volume on the "Development of Biography" by Dr. Dryasdust; I merely wish to write a footnote to such a study which may sometime be useful to some other desiccated person who may develop Mr. Cross's interesting idea.

Of Nepos' biographical dictionary we have only slight remains. It was arranged apparently in eight classes: kings, generals,

statesmen, orators, poets, historians, philosophers, and scholars. Two books were devoted to each class, one dealing with eminent Romans and the other with distinguished foreigners. This juxtaposition of Romans and foreigners probably suggested to Plutarch his parallel lives. Dr. Dryasdust please note. It is possible, too, that this categorical treatment gave to Varro the idea which he developed in his *Imagines*. Here the eminent dead, Roman and otherwise, are assembled in a hebdomadal hierarchy. An introductory book gave two groups of seven as samples. Then followed twice seven books, each containing seven groups of biographies, each group numbering seven. One is reminded of the unhappy party coming from St. Ives. The odd thing about Varro's arrangement is that it required the dead past to furnish an equal number of men of distinction — namely seven times seven — in each of the varied lines of human endeavor; forty-nine Roman statesmen and forty-nine foreign poets. If Nepos is really responsible for this idea he has a great deal to answer for.

It is not my intention to speak of the style in which Nepos' biographies are written. Every historian of Latin literature, however atrocious his own composition may be, seems to feel it his duty to shy a few stones at Nepos. It is not my business to collect and return these offerings. I wish merely to point out what I think has sometimes been overlooked: that in collecting his material and presenting it to the casual reader, in whom he was most interested, Nepos shows a rather surprising breadth of interests.

In the selection of his sources, so far as he quotes them by name, Nepos has shown excellent judgment. He thrice refers to Thucydides (*Them.* 9, 10; *Paus.* 2.), whom he regards as most trustworthy (*potissimum credo*). Xenophon he selects for his authority for Agesilaus (*Ages.* 1) because he was his personal friend. Theopompus and Timaeus are found to be surprisingly lenient toward Alcibiades, for they are usually *maledicentissimi* (*Alcib.* 11). For his information about Hannibal, Nepos turns to Polybius, to Atticus for a date, and to Sulpicius Blitho, besides Hannibal's own biographers Silenus and Sosilus (*Hann.* 13).

But more significant is his recognition of the historical value of Cicero's correspondence with Atticus, "Those who read these letters have not much need of a continuous history of these times" (*Att.* 16).

The lives as we have them clearly show that Nepos distinguished between the writing of history and of biography, and to this difference of technique he specifically refers in the opening sentence of the *Pelopidas* (1), "I fear if I shall begin to give a complete account of his acts that I may seem to be writing a history and not narrating his life." Again in the beginning of the *Epaminondas* (1) Nepos says that he will relegate an account of his deeds to the end of the biography, for he does not agree with the majority, who believe that acts are more important than virtues.

Like most historians, Nepos is interested in moral maxims and generalities: eloquence is more useful than innocence (*Arist.* 1); a coward's mother doesn't usually weep (*Thras.* 2); no government is safe unless founded on good will (*Dion* 5); fortune is changeable (*Dion* 6); tyranny hated (*Dion* 9); democracies ungrateful (*Chabr.* 3); one man (like Epaminondas) can be more valuable than a whole state; overconfidence breeds disaster (*Pelop.* 3); in friendship congeniality means more than consanguinity (*Att.* 5); it is sometimes more useful to listen well than to speak fluently (*Epam.* 3). I do not mean to pretend that these are profound observations: they are quite the reverse, they are just such comments as we could have made ourselves.

Nepos does not appear to be interested in a story for the mere sake of the story. Accordingly, anecdotes are only sparingly used. The retort of the sage Pittacus in the biography of Thrasylus (4) and the pithy, if unkind, sayings of Epaminondas are cases in point. In this connection it is worth while to point out that the supernatural element, the marvelous incident, has been also entirely eliminated. The prodigies with which Livy garnishes his narrative are lacking. The nearest approach to this are the remarks that the elder Dionysius, though he lived to be over sixty, had never buried a child or a grandchild (*Reg.* 2),

and that Timoleon won all his important victories on his birth-days (*Timol.* 5).

Nepos' most conspicuous interest is in national customs. He is often at pains to warn his readers to make allowance for the difference between the Greek and the Roman attitude toward social functions and toward education (*Praef.*). He speaks specifically about the tolerance which prevails in Greece for actors (*Praef.*), of the social freedom of Roman women (*Praef.*), of the Greek custom which permitted a man to marry his half sister (*Cim.* 1), of the social position of the *scriba* at Athens and at Rome (*Eum.* 1), of the large part which music plays in Greek education (*Epam.* 1), of the dislike of the Greeks to do personal homage to a sovereign (*Con.* 3).

In local Greek politics he is a thorough Attic. He repeatedly asserts (*Epam.* 5; *Alcib.* 11) that the Thebans put emphasis on strength of body rather than on keenness of intellect. As Gildersleeve said, "Boeotia had a good climate for eels but a bad air for brains." The double kingship of Sparta is noted, and the two annually elected "kings" (*Hann.* 7) of Carthage are compared to the Roman consuls.

What might be called public and private antiquities are also freely noted. The crowns and garlands of an Olympic victor presented to Alcibiades (*Alcib.* 6); Iphicrates' change in the armor of a foot soldier (*Iph.* 1); Chabrias' change in the formation of the infantry unit (*Chabr.* 1); the Persian satrap's device for exercising his horses when besieged in a small fortress (*Eum.* 5); Cimon's desire for arbitration of disputes between Greek states (*Cim.* 3) — these are a few instances.

In his avoidance of death-bed scenes and dying words Nepos is in agreement with what is now regarded as correct form by biographical writers, though it hardly seems probable that he is deterred from these harrowing narrations, as Mr. Cross thinks the modern biographer is, by a knowledge of the life and works of the streptococcus. But as he is interested in other customs Nepos does frequently advert to the methods of burial. The Spartans preserved their dead generals in honey, but wax was

used for Agesilaus (*Ages.* 8). A dying king presents his ring to his chosen successor (*Eum.* 2). Phocion was buried by slaves, for no freeman dared perform the rites (*Phoc.* 4). Eumenes gave Crateros a fine funeral (*Eum.* 4) and expressed his bones home to his wife and children — a courtesy which was in turn performed for Eumenes by Antigonus (*Eum.* 13).

It also interests Nepos to compare antiquity with his own day. He laments that Roman commanders of his own time do not display the modesty of Agesilaus (*Ages.* 4); the license of the soldiers of Alexander is exactly like that of the Roman soldiers of the civil war (*Eum.* 8); the soldiers of Macedon enjoyed the same reputation that now belongs to the Roman legions (*Eum.* 3); the soldiers of Iphicrates are compared to those of Q. Fabius Maximus, and we are told that in the good old times of Scipio justice and not money ruled the state (*Cat.* 2).

Art and archaeology, too, are favorite topics with Nepos. The walls of Themistocles were made (*Them.* 6) of fragments from shrines and tombs; Cimon's wall on the Acropolis was built with the money from the spoils (*Cim.* 2) of Thasos. Chabrias' statue kneeling on one knee with the spear advanced gave a pose frequently imitated in athletic statues of later date (*Chabr.* 1); the first instance in which both a father and son were accorded statues at Athens is noted (*Timoth.* 2), and the date is given for the erection of the first altar to Peace at Athens (*Timoth.* 2); Timoleon had a private shrine to Luck (*Timol.* 4); the temple of Jupiter Feretrius on the Capitol was restored by Julius Caesar (*Att.* 20).

A well-restrained curiosity in language is also apparent in Nepos' work. The correct meaning of *tyrannus* is pointed out (*Milt.* 8), the Latin equivalent for the *medimnus* is given (*Att.* 2), and the Persian name for a special class of infantry (*Dat.* 8). Hannibal crossed the Alps by the Graian pass (*Hann.* 3), a name derived from the earlier use of the same route by the Greek Heracles.

Of myths, those dealing with Orestes, Alcmaeon, Oedipus (*Epam.* 6), and Heracles (*Hann.* 3) are briefly noted.

Nepos' interest in literature is shown by his full discussion of Atticus' literary work and by numerous brief allusions (*Dion* 6; *Dat.* 2). Homer is twice quoted, a verse from an unidentified Latin poet is preserved in the *Atticus* (11), and Lucretius and Catullus are spoken of as the two greatest poets of his day (*Att.* 12). To these is added a third, L. Junius Calidus—not otherwise known. In the biography of Hannibal (13) space is given to his literary interests and to his writings, and in the very abbreviated sketch of the elder Cato some facts about his writings not otherwise preserved are given. Nepos' own estimate of the importance of literature is here made clear, "To have brought Ennius to Rome was a greater triumph for Cato than any he secured in Sardinia" (*Cat.* 1).

It has been reserved for Nepos to make the only fair and objective estimate of Hannibal that exists (so far as I know) in Roman literature:

If it is true (as everybody knows) that the Roman People surpass all nations in bravery, it cannot be denied that Hannibal as far outshines other commanders in ability as the Roman People are superior to all others in courage; for whenever he fought with them in Italy he was ever victorious. And if he had not been hampered by the jealousy of his own people it seems that he could have conquered the Romans. But the envy of many brought to naught the courage of one.

In a recent address on one of the much-defamed characters of the Renaissance, a friend of mine paused to interject a brief apologia for Judas Iscariot. It has not been the purpose of this paper to exalt Nepos to the rank of Plutarch—though Macaulay held no high idea of the latter—or of Boswell. I have tried merely to point out that his interests are wide and varied and that he has enriched his brief sketches with observations from many fields of knowledge. As to his rank as a historian and a stylist, as Nepos himself has said, "that is another story."

THE CHRONOLOGY OF CAESAR'S CONSULSHIP

By FRANK BURR MARSH
University of Texas

A few years ago I ventured to put forward a somewhat new view of the significance and purpose of the Vatinian law.¹ I then accepted the date generally given for its passage, namely, the last day in February. This date is assumed because Cicero (*Respecting the Consular Provinces* 15) makes it clear that the first day on which a successor could take over Cisalpine Gaul was March 1, 54.² The simplest explanation of this would be that the Vatinian law was passed on February 28, 59 and took effect immediately, as was usual with Roman laws. However, as this date has been questioned,³ it may be worth while to review the evidence with some care, which will involve a consideration of the chronology of Caesar's entire consulship, in which the passage of this law was only a single incident, although a most important one.

Our chief authorities for the events of 59 B.C. are Cicero, Suetonius, Plutarch, Dio, and Appian. Professor Sage regards the order in which the last four of these arrange the events of the year as entitled to weight, and the first point to be considered is the truth of this.

¹ In my book, *The Founding of the Roman Empire*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1922.

² R. Laqueur has attacked this conclusion in the *Neue Jahrbücher für Klassisches Altertum*, XLV (1920) and XLVII (1921). His theory, if accepted, would not greatly affect my arguments for the early passage of the law.

³ Sage, E. T., "The Date of the Vatinian Law," *Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, XXXIX (1918), 367-82; and Gelzer, M., *Cäsar: Der Politiker und Staatsmann*, Berlin, 1921, p. 69. Professor Gelzer gives his reasons in *Gnomon*, I (1925), 272. Professor Tenney Frank has criticized Sage's views in a brief note in the *Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, XLI (1920), 276-77, but he has not considered the general question of the chronology of the year and he could not take account of Gelzer's theory, which was not published at the time.

It is obvious that our only contemporary source is Cicero. From his letters we can date several events with certainty, and these it will be well to note at the beginning:

1. The trial of Antonius took place very early in the year, as the jury which was to try him was being selected in December, 60 (*Att. ii. 2*).

2. In his speech in favor of Antonius Cicero gave offense to the triumvirs, especially Caesar, and Clodius was at once made a plebeian (Cicero *For his House* 16; Suet. *Caes.* 20; Dio xxxviii. 10). It is clear that Clodius had become a plebeian before April 16 (*Att. ii. 7*).⁴

3. The first agrarian law had been passed before April 15 (*Att. ii. 6*).

4. On the last day of April Cicero first learned the provisions of the second agrarian law, and the law in favor of the knights had then been published at least (*Att. ii. 16*).

5. In the next day or two Cicero heard of the marriage of Pompey and Julia (*Att. ii. 17*).

6. The affair of Vettius occurred in the middle of August (*Att. ii. 24*).

From our other sources we can confirm one of these dates, where the reference in the letters is a little obscure, and add another to the list. That the first agrarian law was passed before April 15 we have abundant evidence, all the more convincing because incidental. Dio says (xxxviii. 7) that Metellus Celer took the oath required of all senators by this law. Moreover Plutarch (*Cato Minor* 32) makes Cicero urge Cato to take the oath, and the orator had left Rome by April 13. From Cicero (*Att. ii. 5*) we know that Metellus was dead by April 14. Further both Suetonius and Dio clearly place the retirement of Bibulus to his house after the first agrarian law and before the second. If they are correct he must have retired before April 15, and this is confirmed by Plutarch (*Pompey* 48), who says that Bibulus stayed in his house for the remaining eight months of his

⁴ Throughout this paper I have followed the dates assigned to the letters by F. F. Abbott in the *Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, XIX (1898), 389-405.

term as consul, which would make him retire in April.⁵ This again is confirmed by Cicero (*Att.* ii. 16), who tells us that Bibulus had been observing the heavens before the beginning of May. If it stood alone, this last reference might be explained away; but, when we consider it in connection with the others, it seems to me decisive. The retirement of Bibulus must, therefore, have taken place early in April.

These dates may be regarded as fixed, with only a slight variation possible in either direction, and there can be no serious question of the sequence of events. Yet our four narrative sources have *all* violated this sequence if we look merely at the order in which they mention the events in question. Suetonius refers to Cicero's speech for Antonius, the transfer of Clodius to the plebeians, and the marriage of Pompey and Julia after the

⁵ Täubler, E., *Bellum Helveticum: Eine Caesar-Studie*, Gotha, 1924, pp. 55-57, to whom I owe one point in what precedes, considers the eight months of Plutarch in conflict with the retirement of Bibulus in early April (a date which he regards as positively fixed by Suetonius and Cicero), since this would keep him in his house for nearly nine months. I take it that Plutarch has counted from May because Bibulus did perform some public duties in April and because his remaining at home only became an effective public protest in May. In April, as Täubler points out, Caesar had the fasces and so took the lead in official business generally and presided over the senate. During that month, therefore, Bibulus could shut himself up without obviously neglecting his public duties. When in May the fasces reverted to him, his failure to appear amounted to a formal declaration that, owing to the lawless violence of his colleague, he was unable to fulfill his functions as consul. No doubt Bibulus complained of Caesar's conduct in his edicts, but he would have no occasion to issue an edict until he failed to perform some official duty, as when he remained at home after May 1, or when he announced that he was observing the heavens in order to invalidate any laws passed by Caesar. This last he seems to have done before the end of the month, from the allusion in Cicero (*Att.* ii. 16, written May 1 or 2). The only comitial days in April, after the 3d and 4th, were the 24th and the 27th to the 30th inclusive. It seems doubtful whether when he first retired to his house Bibulus had fully determined on his course of action. He may well have held private consultations with the leading senators and only made his renunciation of his duties public toward the end of the month. In this case Plutarch would be quite justified in saying that he stayed at home for the remaining eight months of his term. It seems to me that Suetonius and Plutarch may both be correct, the one thinking of the time when Bibulus retired to his house, the other of the time during which he refused to perform the duties of his office.

passage of the second agrarian law; Plutarch puts the marriage before the passage of the agrarian laws; Appian places both the retirement of Bibulus and the marriage after the affair of Vettius; Dio makes Cicero's defense of Antonius come after the affair of Vettius, and the transfer of Clodius just before his election as tribune, which cannot have occurred before the middle of the year and probably took place near the end. Moreover Plutarch is inconsistent with himself. In *Cato Minor* (31) he refers to the marriage before the introduction of the agrarian laws, while in *Pompey* (47-48) and *Caesar* (14) he makes it follow their introduction but precede their passage. As to the Vatinian law, which cannot be dated exactly from Cicero, there is an even division among the four. Suetonius and Plutarch mention it after the marriage, but Dio and Appian put it before, and, in addition, both Plutarch and Appian state its provisions wrongly.

From these apparent errors and contradictions it would seem that the writers were either ignorant of the chronology of the year, or else did not attempt to arrange their narratives chronologically. If the order in which they mention events is to be given weight, whose order is to be followed? Are we to say with Appian that the retirement of Bibulus came after the affair of Vettius, or with Dio that it came before? As to the Vatinian law, confusion is worse confounded. All four refer to it toward the end of their account of Caesar's consulship, but they do not agree in dating it late in the year. Suetonius mentions it after the affair of Vettius, hence after August, as does also Appian. But, on the other hand, Appian makes it precede the marriage, hence it must have been passed before May, and in this Dio supports him. Plutarch merely puts it after the marriage, hence any time after the beginning of May. It is clearly impossible to base any conclusion on the point in their narrative at which these writers refer to an event. Professor Sage admits this in part, for he concedes that, although Suetonius was careful of chronology, he was ignorant of the date of the affair of Vettius, and that his order for the last part of 60 B.C. is not strictly chronological.⁶

⁶ His argument that here the order of Suetonius is logical seems to me conclusive and I wonder that he did not see that the same is true for 59 B.C.

Most of the confusion in these writers is apparent rather than real and is due to two things: in the first place, they have followed a logical instead of a chronological order; and, in the second, they did not always distinguish between two separate events having the same general character. If we make allowance for these two disturbing factors and look only at their positive indications of chronology we shall find that they are reasonably consistent with themselves and with Cicero as well.

To take the second point first, we need to bear in mind that Caesar passed two distinct agrarian laws, the second of which dealt with the Campanian land and resulted in making Capua a Roman colony. The first was passed, as has been shown, early in April and the second was not published till the end of that month and so cannot have been passed before May. If a writer chose to treat the agrarian legislation as a whole without distinguishing between the two laws, which, if he were not interested in chronology, would be a very natural course, this might give rise to an apparent error. Caesar, moreover, acquired the two Gauls at different times and in different ways. Cisalpine Gaul with three legions was given him by the Vatinian law, while the senate afterwards voted him the Transalpine province and a fourth legion. If a writer regarded the acquisition of the Gauls as one event, he would naturally date it by the vote of the senate rather than by the Vatinian law — that is, by its completion instead of its beginning — unless he had some motive for doing otherwise. Lastly, the events connected with Clodius were spread over nearly the whole year. He was made a plebeian very early and was a candidate for the office of tribune by April 18 (*Att.* ii. 12), but he was probably not elected till toward the end of the year. A writer might, therefore, mention Clodius at almost any point in his narrative of Caesar's consulship, and, whenever he did mention him, it would be natural to tell all about him.

Now a brief inspection of our narrative sources will show that all the writers except Plutarch have followed a logical rather than a chronological order, and that the apparent confusion arises

partly from this circumstance and partly from their failure to distinguish between events which in a logical sense belonged naturally together.

In Suetonius the logical order is very clear. He first traces the course of events through the passage of the first agrarian bill and the retirement of Bibulus to his house leaving Caesar practically sole consul. Then follow Caesar's measures to gain popularity; namely, the second agrarian law, the law in favor of the knights, and others not particularized. After this come the measures by which Caesar sought to intimidate his opponents; namely, the arrest of Cato, the bullying of Lucullus, the transfer of Clodius to the plebs, and finally the affair of Vettius, which Suetonius represents as an attempt of Caesar to threaten all his enemies at once. The account then closes with Caesar's measures to safeguard himself after his term as consul expired; namely, the marriage of Pompey and Julia and the acquisition of the Gauls.

Dio is quite as logical as Suetonius. He enumerates first the laws passed during the year and then takes up the other events. In dealing with the legislation of 59 he begins with the laws proposed by Caesar himself and then deals with those proposed by others, though sometimes instigated by Caesar. The Vatinius law falls naturally in this last class, and the marriage is of course placed among the other events of the year.

In Appian the logical order is almost equally clear. We have first the steps by which Caesar gained sole control of the state; namely, the agrarian laws, the affair of Vettius, which Appian regards as leading to the establishment of Caesar's complete autocracy, and the retirement of Bibulus. Then come the other measures by which Caesar made himself popular and his use of this popularity to obtain the Gauls. Last of all, Appian discusses Caesar's measures to protect himself in the future; namely, the marriage and the selection of the magistrates for the next year.

Plutarch has given us no single detailed account of Caesar's consulship, but in several of his *Lives* he has mentioned some of the events of the year. In the *Cato Minor* (31-33) he distinguishes between the two agrarian laws, but in his *Caesar* (14)

and in his *Pompey* (47-48) he treats the agrarian legislation as a whole. This leads him to commit an apparent error, as will be shown presently.

It is, therefore, clear that we are not entitled to regard the order in which events are mentioned in any of the four as intended to be chronological, and that we can assume this only when they distinctly say that one event followed another, or when they make one depend in some way upon another. If we consider carefully the positive chronological data which they give us, it will be found that they are reasonably exact. Thus Plutarch says that as consul Caesar immediately introduced his agrarian law. This is confirmed by Dio and Suetonius, and, when we recall the bitter conflict which the first law provoked and the fact that it was carried not later than the first part of April, this must be considered approximately correct. Plutarch also affirms, in both his *Pompey* and his *Caesar*, that the law was passed immediately after the marriage of Pompey and Julia. As, in these *Lives*, he does not distinguish between the two laws, and as the second was passed after the marriage, this must also be regarded as correct. In *Pompey* (48) Plutarch states that as a result of the agrarian laws the people were ready to vote for anything put before them. In this mood they ratified Pompey's *acta*, gave Caesar the Gauls, and elected consuls for the next year who were favorable to the triumvirs. Here the acquisition of the two Gauls is treated as a single event and dated by the assignment of Transalpine Gaul, which did follow the marriage and probably the passage of the second agrarian law as well. The senate handed the province over to Caesar because it feared that, if it refused, the people would vote it to him as they had already voted him Cisalpine Gaul (Suetonius, 22); and thus Caesar's popularity in the first part of the year was a factor in the acquisition of both the Gauls, as Plutarch asserts. The biographer has twice treated two separate events as one, but, allowing for this, he has committed no real error.

Suetonius is likewise exact in his positive indications of chronology. Professor Sage finds one mistake which I believe is due

only to a misunderstanding. After enumerating Caesar's measures to intimidate his opponents, which culminated in the affair of Vettius, Suetonius continues that about the same time (*sub idem tempus*) Caesar married his daughter Julia to Pompey, although she had been betrothed to Servilius Caepio, who had shortly before (*paulo ante*) helped Caesar in his struggle with Bibulus, and that Caesar then proceeded to seize the Gauls with the help of his son-in-law. Does this mean, as Professor Sage supposes, that Suetonius believed that the marriage took place at the same time as the affair of Vettius, so that we must conclude that he was ignorant of the true date of that affair? This seems to me a misinterpretation of the phrase *sub idem tempus*. Its purpose is to connect, not two specific events, but two series of events. Caesar intimidated his enemies and while doing so, at about the same time, he took precautions for the future. Even if it be held that *sub idem tempus* can refer only to the two events between which it stands, the expression is vague and would mean merely that the two events in question were not far apart, that one was not at the beginning and the other at the end of the year, but that both were somewhere toward the middle, which was quite true. The matter of the Gauls we can best consider later in connection with the theory of Professor Gelzer.

Dio contains few indications of chronology. The most important is when he tells us that Caesar, fearing that Pompey might make some change in his absence since Gabinus (Pompey's henchman) was to be consul, bound both Pompey and Piso, the other consul, to him by family ties. Now Caesar knew that he would be absent from Rome for five years as soon as the Vatinian law was carried, and we know from Cicero (*Att.* ii. 5) that Gabinus was mentioned for the consulship by political gossip as early as April 14. It is quite likely, therefore, that he and Piso had been decided upon as candidates for the chief magistracy before the marriage of Pompey and Julia at the beginning of May. In this matter there is thus no reason to question Dio's chronology. At the beginning of the next chapter, however, he seems at first glance to make Cicero's defense of Antonius come

after the affair of Vettius, but here his language can equally well mean that the charges of Vettius strengthened the suspicion already aroused in the minds of the triumvirs by the speech. Only one certain error can be found in Dio, and this is where he puts the transfer of Clodius to the plebs immediately before his election as tribune. In this the historian might easily have been misled by a careless expression in some earlier writer.

The chronology of Appian is less accurate than that of the others, and he has misdated the affair of Vettius and the tribuneship of Vatinius.⁷ He begins his account of Caesar's consulship with the agrarian laws, which he does not distinguish, and then passes to the affair of Vettius, with which he connects the retirement of Bibulus to his house. In dealing with Vettius he tells us that the people agreed to protect Caesar against conspirators. The most obvious way to do this would be to furnish him a guard, and, although Appian does not say explicitly that this was what was done, I believe that this was what he thought happened. In his source he had found references to an armed force under Caesar, for he asserts that at the beginning of his consulship, before he presented his agrarian bill to the senate (from his description it is clear that he had the second in mind), Caesar secretly got together a band of soldiers. Appian, therefore, seems to have thought that Caesar had an army, or at least an armed force, at the time of the passage of the agrarian laws, that this was legalized after the affair of Vettius, and that, after Caesar had obtained legal sanction for his troops, Bibulus retired and left his colleague sole master of the commonwealth. Appian next mentions the measures by which Caesar made himself so popular that he was able to obtain the two Gauls. The measures thus mentioned are the law ratifying Pompey's *acta*, the law in favor of the knights, and a reckless expenditure on spectacles and shows for the people. We do not know the date of the ratification of Pompey's *acta*, but it is not unlikely that it was carried through in May; the law in favor of the knights was proposed, if not carried, in April; and we know from Cicero (*Att.* ii. 17) that by

⁷ Appian also, a little later (ii. 23), sends Cato to Cyprus in 55 instead of 58.

May there had been a lavish expenditure of money, perhaps at the games celebrated in April.⁸ Thus all the events which Appian represents as leading up to the acquisition of the Gauls, which he treats as a single event, may have preceded the vote of the senate giving him the Transalpine province. As we have seen, Suetonius makes Caesar's popularity the reason why the conscript fathers voted him this province, and in this case Appian's chronology is probably correct. Appian closes with Caesar's precautions for the future. Foreseeing a long absence and fearing the possible defection of Pompey, he arranged the marriage and filled the offices for the next year with his partisans. From this it seems clear that Appian thought that the marriage followed the acquisition of the Gauls, or at least of one of them. If Appian's chronology appears confused, it is because he has not distinguished between the two provinces, which was unnecessary when he merely indicated causal relations and made no attempt to fix dates. Caesar foresaw a long absence, after the Vatinian law, and arranged the marriage; he courted the people, and by their favor he got Transalpine Gaul from the senate. Appian may have understood the sequence perfectly, but the plan of his narrative did not call for a detailed explanation of it. He ends, however, with two definite errors, making Vatinius tribune for 58 instead of 59, and Gabinius a friend of Caesar instead of Pompey. This certainly suggests a doubt as to the clearness of his understanding of the chronology of the year, but it is very probable that his sources, like himself, did not mention the Vatinian law by name.

The confusion of our sources is, therefore, more apparent than real and arises from the unfounded assumption that they attempted a chronological order, when their arrangement is, on the contrary, logical, and from the further fact that they did not always try to distinguish between separate events which formed a single logical whole.

It remains to consider in some detail the date of the Vatinian law. Professor Sage holds that it was passed in the last six months, and probably in the last four, of Caesar's consulship.

⁸ The *Ludi Megalenses*, the *Ludi Ceriales*, and the *Ludi Florales* all came between April 4 and May 3.

His argument from the arrangement of events in the sources has been sufficiently discussed. His other arguments, based on probabilities, need not be examined at length if it can be shown that there is positive evidence for an earlier date. This I believe can be adduced, but it is first necessary to take account of the theory of Professor Gelzer, who maintains that the law was passed in June. His reasons for this date are two, a passage in Suetonius and the silence of Cicero. The biographer, having mentioned the marriage of Pompey and Julia and that of Caesar and Calpurnia, says: *Socero (Piso) igitur generoque (Pompey) suffragantibus ex omni provinciarum copia Gallias potissimum elegit, cuius emolumenta et opportunitate idonea sit materia triumphorum. Et initio quidem Galliam Cisalpinam Illyrico adiecto lege Vatinia accepit; mox per senatum Comatam quoque, veritis patribus ne, si ipsi negassent, populus et hanc daret.* This passage seems fairly clear. We know from Cicero (*Att.* viii. 3) that Pompey did support Caesar in getting Transalpine Gaul. The orator in heaping reproaches upon Pompey blames him for having helped Caesar to add Farther Gaul to his provinces. This plainly implies that Pompey did not openly assist Caesar in getting Cisalpine Gaul and Illyricum and that these were obtained first. If we read Suetonius carefully he does not disagree with this. He says that with the help of his son-in-law Caesar obtained the Gauls, which he chose in the hope of gaining military glory. Now the material for triumphs was obviously to be found rather in Transalpine than in Cisalpine Gaul, but Suetonius speaks of both together. Then he adds as an afterthought, or qualification, that Caesar first got Cisalpine Gaul and Illyricum and that soon (*mox*) afterwards he was given the other province by the senate. This accords well enough with Cicero, for the word *mox* is vague and could easily mean two or three months later. From the orator and the biographer combined we may conclude that Caesar first secured Cisalpine Gaul from the people and that, after his marriage with Julia, Pompey assisted him in forcing the senate to grant him the Transalpine province as well.⁹

⁹ T. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic*, I, 325, is clearly in error when he makes Pompey and the consuls-elect support the Vatinian law.

Professor Gelzer's main argument, however, is the silence of Cicero. From April 13 to May 4 we have almost daily letters from the orator to Atticus, and these contain no explicit mention of the Vatinian law. Professor Gelzer rightly holds that Cicero could not have failed to notice so important a measure and draws the conclusion that it cannot have been passed till after the marriage. An examination of the letters will, I think, show that this conclusion is unwarranted by the premise. Cicero comments freely on the events then happening in Rome, but never refers, except incidentally, to earlier ones. What his silence really proves is that the Vatinian law was not passed between April 13 and May 4: it may have been enacted either before or after those dates, and it only remains to determine which. The case is exactly the same for the first agrarian law. This was certainly carried before the series of letters begins, but Cicero only mentions it casually by referring to the board of twenty commissioners appointed under it (*Att.* ii. 6). There was no reason for speaking of it explicitly, since Atticus knew all about it and was well aware of Cicero's views on the subject. Yet this law, which resulted in driving Bibulus from public life, was surely of the utmost importance. The same considerations apply to the Vatinian law, and, if it was passed before April 13, all we can expect to find in the letters will be incidental references, which fortunately are not lacking. On April 15, in praising Antium and its quiet, Cicero wrote (*Att.* ii. 6), "Think that there should be a place so near Rome where there are many who have never seen Vatinius!" The next day (*Att.* ii. 7), in discussing a profitable embassy, he supposes that it is reserved for either Drusus of Pisaurum or Vatinius, and on April 19 (*Att.* ii. 9) he says of the triumvirs, "let them make whom they please consuls and tribunes and even cover the wen of Vatinius with the double-dyed purple robe of the priesthood." From these expressions it is clear that Vatinius had already done something remarkable and something for which Cicero expected that the men in power would reward him. This achievement can hardly be anything but the passage of the Vatinian law. This impression is strengthened by the speech of Cicero against

Vatinius. There we are told that Vatinius had hoped to be named augur in place of Metellus Celer, and Cicero had heard of this vacancy by April 14 (*Att.* ii. 5). In the speech (8) the orator asks Vatinius how he could have joined in the customary decree of the augurs concerning the auspices when he had himself ignored them. Cicero has already said (7) that Vatinius had passed a law in spite of the fact that three of his fellow tribunes were observing the heavens; and this, it seems to me, can only have been the Vatinian law, which must have been enacted before April 13, when the letters to Atticus begin.

But there is still another reference which, taken in connection with those just mentioned, seems to me decisive. On May 1 or 2 (*Att.* ii. 16), when Cicero first learns the provisions of the second agrarian law, he is very angry, and he represents Pompey as meeting all objections of the conservatives with the blunt retort, "I shall hold you down by the army of Caesar" (*Oppressos vos tenebo exercitu Caesaris*). The explanation which Professor Gelzer gives of this expression, namely, that "army" refers to the colonists who were to be given land in Campania, seems to me rather strained.¹⁰ I cannot believe that Cicero would have used the word "army" of any unorganized body of future colonists, and I am forced to the conclusion that Caesar did actually have an army by the first of May. Now under the Vatinian law he could easily have obtained one. That law made him proconsul of Gaul while he was still consul; and, as proconsul, he could enlist soldiers for service in his province and keep them near Rome until he was ready to leave the city. Later, as proconsul of the Spains, Pompey did precisely this same thing. If the Vatinian law was passed before April, Caesar would have had time to organize such a force in the neighborhood of Rome. The helplessness of the conservatives was due to the presence of this army, and the course of events seems to show that the Vatinian law was passed before the first agrarian law.

Ferrero has sought to explain the passage of the Vatinian law

¹⁰ The explanation of Professor Sage seems to me still less satisfactory. If the word "army" is used figuratively it probably refers to Caesar's mob, in which there were many of Pompey's veterans.

so early in 59 by assuming that the death of Metellus Celer gave Caesar an opportunity to seize Cisalpine Gaul of which he took prompt advantage, fearing to wait lest the senate should forestall him.¹¹ This conjecture, however, is in conflict with the data furnished by the sources. Dio informs us (xxxviii. 7) that Metellus took the oath prescribed by the first agrarian law itself to observe its provisions. If this be true, the acceptance of Ferrero's theory forces us to date the passage of the first agrarian law in February at the latest. Suetonius and Dio both make Bibulus retire to his house immediately after the passage of the agrarian law, and Plutarch says he was shut up for eight months. I have tried to show that Plutarch might have ignored a part of a month, but it seems to me incredible that he should have omitted two entire months, during the first of which Bibulus had the fasces, so that his failure to appear could not be overlooked. In order to connect the death of Metellus with the Vatinian law we are forced to reject the testimony of either Suetonius, Dio, or Plutarch. We have no right to do this unless we can prove them to have been either careless or ill informed, and this, as has been shown, we cannot do. We are certainly not justified in setting aside positive statements, or very clear implications,¹² of our sources as to chronology simply because they do not fit our conjectures. It is our business to frame our theories in accordance with the data of our sources, and it is not difficult to explain the early passage of the Vatinian law in harmony with them if we consider the political situation.

¹¹ *The Greatness and Decline of Rome*, London, 1907, I, 290 and note. His theory has been accepted by several other scholars, such as Heitland, W. E., *The Roman Republic*, Cambridge, 1909, III, 135 and note 2; Boak, A. E. R., *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.*, New York, 1921, 166; and Frank, Tenney, *A History of Rome*, New York, 1923, 276. Professor Frank also accepts it in his criticism of Sage's date (see note 3 of this article). There is no clear evidence that Metellus had Cisalpine Gaul, and I am strongly inclined to believe that he was proconsul of the Transalpine province. His sudden death may have furnished an opening for the later assignment of this province to Caesar by the senate. Our only information as to his province is derived from *Att.* i. 19, 20.

¹² Suetonius and Dio do not say in so many words that Bibulus retired immediately after the passage of the agrarian law, but their narratives make it clear that they believed this to be the case.

All our narrative sources agree that the first agrarian law was passed in flagrant violation of the Roman constitution. Unable to secure the co-operation of the senate, Caesar took the law directly to the assembly, only to find all progress blocked by the stubborn opposition of Bibulus and three of the tribunes. Legally there was nothing more to be done, and he must either drop the bill or carry it in defiance of the law. To drive his colleague from the forum and then declare the bill passed was easy, but it might prove dangerous. The senate could declare martial law and commission Bibulus to restore order, or, if the conscript fathers did not wish to go so far, they could simply declare the law null and void. Caesar could gain nothing, therefore, unless he had such physical force behind him that the senate and the conservatives did not dare to make any attempt to defend the constitution. This the Vatinius law gave him, and without an army at his back he could hardly have ventured on the course he took. The fact that he had an army near Rome explains why the senate, when appealed to by Bibulus, refused to take any action. This refusal is attested by Suetonius, Dio, and Appian. Suetonius gives no reason for it; Dio attributes it to the enthusiasm of the people; but Appian explains it as due to the force and preparation of Caesar, which the senate had no means of resisting. It seems clear that these writers had no clear understanding of the situation, and this is not difficult to explain. All of them wrote under the Empire, when the technicalities of the Republican constitution had lost all force and when the praetorian guard had become a familiar institution. They might easily miss the significance of an army camped near Rome in putting pressure on the senate. This failure to grasp the situation may be demonstrated for Plutarch and Appian. In 71 B.C. Crassus and Pompey were elected consuls, though neither of them was legally eligible, and, during their term of office in 70, they destroyed Sulla's constitution. Their success was due to the fact that they were both in command of armies in Italy and that they brought their armies up to the city under the pretense that they were seeking triumphs. Moreover, after their election as consuls they still kept their

armies outside Rome. Both Appian (i. 121) and Plutarch (*Pompey* 21) mention the retention of the armies, but neither seems to think that the fact had any real importance, though Plutarch has a moment of suspicion. In view of this it is not surprising that neither should have seen the significance of Caesar's army, or that Suetonius and Dio should have been equally blind. If the immediate purpose of the Vatinian law, namely, to arm Caesar, was missed, it was both logical and natural to treat the law as intended simply to provide for Caesar's future and to mention it toward the end of his consulship.

Professor Sage has argued that Caesar was not popular enough to secure such a prize as Cisalpine Gaul till after he had bribed the people and the knights by laws for their benefit. In politics, however, gratitude has been well defined as a lively expectation of favors to come, and Caesar would be strongest with both classes before the measures which they desired had been carried. Once his legislation had been enacted, they were no longer obliged by their own self-interest to support him. As a matter of fact we have the explicit testimony of Cicero that, though Caesar was popular with the lower classes at the beginning of the year, by July there had been a great change in public sentiment and the triumvirs were universally hated (*Att.* ii. 19. 21). This mattered little, of course, while they had Caesar's army at hand. Professor Sage is forced to assume that toward the end of the year there was a revival of Caesar's popularity, but of this there is no evidence whatever.

We are, therefore, justified in concluding that the Vatinian law was passed before the first agrarian law and that both were enacted before April 10, since we know that Metellus swore to observe the agrarian law and that he died after an illness of three days (*Cicero For M. Caelius* 24). As Caesar's term expired on February 28, 54, we may infer that the Vatinian law was passed on February 28, 59. It is, however, possible that it was passed later. Appian suggests that Caesar began gathering troops before he had a legal right to do so, and he might have inserted a clause in the Vatinian law dating back the beginning of his pro-

consulship to give some show of legality to his action. In this case we might suppose that the law was published in February and passed in March. It seems more likely, however, that the generally accepted date is correct.

It is not improbable that at first Caesar tried to observe the technical rules as to legislation in the assembly. Cicero in April declares (*Att.* ii. 9) that the triumvirs had violated the *lex Caecilia-Didia*, which imposed an interval of seventeen days (*trinundinum*) between the publication of a law and the vote on it in the assembly. He is, perhaps, thinking of the transfer of Clodius to the plebs (*For his House* 16). If Caesar did observe the rules as to the interval and the comitial days, we can reconstruct the chronology roughly as follows:

1. Caesar proposes the first agrarian bill in the senate in January. His colleague had the fasces for this month, but, if Bibulus could ask the senate to annul the law in April, Caesar could propose it in January.

2. Seeing the opposition of the senate, Caesar publishes the bill on February 1, perhaps hoping to frighten the senate. Amendments were still possible if the conscript fathers were willing to co-operate.

3. The senate discusses the bill during the first part of February.

4. Vatinius publishes his bill on February 11, Caesar having abandoned all hope of working with the senate.

5. Caesar brings the agrarian bill before the assembly on February 18-20. Bibulus, however, blocks any action (*Dio xxxviii. 4*).¹⁸

6. The Vatinian law is passed on February 28, although three tribunes were observing the heavens.

7. Caesar gathers troops during March.

¹⁸ The public declaration of Pompey and Crassus in favor of the agrarian bill (*Dio xxxviii. 5*; *Plutarch Caesar* 14 and *Pompey* 47) may have occurred February 18-20, 22, 25, or it may have taken place in March, perhaps March 3-6. I am inclined to think that Pompey's threat to meet force with force may have had some influence in preventing any attempt to annul the Vatinian law.

8. Bibulus holds a caucus of the senators toward the end of March and they decide to continue the obstruction (Appian ii. 11).¹⁴

9. The agrarian law is passed by the assembly on April 3. A comparison of Dio xxxviii. 4 and 6 shows that it was submitted to the people twice.

10. Bibulus complains to the senate, and, when no action is taken, he retires to his house on April 4.

11. Before April 8 the senators swear to observe the law. Saturninus allowed five days for the oath in his agrarian law, Caesar may have given only three.

12. Metellus Celer takes the oath on April 8, or, if Caesar allowed the senators but three days, on April 6.

13. Death of Metellus between April 9 and 11.

14. Cicero leaves Rome for Antium on April 12.

15. From Antium Cicero writes to Atticus on April 13 (*Att.* ii. 4).

16. Caesar proposes his law in favor of the knights, and, perhaps, that to ratify Pompey's *acta*, in April. Plutarch (*Lucullus* 42) seems to put this last later, shortly before the affair of Vettius.

17. Caesar proposes his second agrarian law at the end of April.

18. Pompey marries Julia on May 1 or 2.

19. Caesar's laws are carried, April 24, 27-30, or during May.

20. The senate assigns Transalpine Gaul to Caesar in May or June.

21. Public opinion turns against the triumvirs in June and July.

22. The affair of Vettius occurs in August.

23. The elections for the next year are held in October (*Att.* ii. 21).

24. Caesar passes other laws whose date cannot be determined.

In such a scheme as the above the exact days must in many

¹⁴ The senators may have urged Bibulus and the conservative tribunes to resort to the veto, which required their presence in the assembly and was therefore dangerous, because they had found by the passage of the Vatinian law that Caesar was not likely to respect the *obnuntiatio*.

cases be conjectural. Thus we could fix March 31 for the passing of the agrarian law, making Bibulus retire on April 1 and dating back the events in (11) and (12) to correspond. The approximate dates and the general sequence of events, which is all that is of real importance, seem to me fairly well established by our sources, and, in setting precise dates to some events, I have only aimed at showing that it is not difficult to work out a chronological scheme which shall take account of such technicalities as comitial days and shall yet be consistent with all the data which we have at hand.

If the conclusion reached above as to the date and purpose of the Vatinian law are correct, we are forced to take a new view of Caesar's consulship. He was not, as he has been generally represented, a popular leader disregarding outworn legal pedantries to enact necessary legislation, but a military dictator subverting the Roman constitution by armed force.¹⁵ This is certainly the view which Cicero took of him, as a reading of his letters will show. The orator emphatically asserts again and again that the triumvirs have become universally unpopular, but he never imagines that this will make the slightest difference in the situation. All that the public hatred can accomplish is to irritate the men in power, and Cicero fears that this irritation may lead to a massacre. It does not occur to Cicero that the triumvirs are in any way dependent on popular favor, and such complete independence of both senate and people can, as it seems to me, only have been due to the support of an army. On this point it may be well to quote a few passages from Cicero's letters. In June or early July he wrote (*Att.* ii. 18): "We are held fast on every side and no longer make the least objection to servitude but

¹⁵ Professor Frank suggests that Caesar, at the time of the Vatinian law, may have desired to have near Rome a body of troops to overawe the senate in case of an emergency (see his article cited in note 3), but he does not tell us whether the emergency ever arose. He thus fails to see what seems to me the really vital point in the character of Caesar's consulship, perhaps because of his acceptance of Ferrero's theory as to the passing of the Vatinian law. At any rate Professor Frank in his *History of Rome* does not intimate that Caesar's army played a rôle of any importance during his consulships, or even that he had an army near Rome.

fear death and exile as though they were greater evils, whereas they are much smaller. And though all groan about this condition with one voice, no one speaks out. . . . Everything has come down to this, that there is no hope of private citizens or even of the magistrates being free again. Yet amid this oppression conversation in friendly gatherings and at dinner tables is freer than it was. Resentment is beginning to conquer fear, but still everyone is filled with the utmost despair." In July he declares (*Att.* ii. 19) that "nothing was ever so infamous, so shameful, so offensive to men of all sorts, classes, and ages as the present state of affairs." He recounts some incidents at the games,¹⁶ where the public feeling was manifested, and adds that the triumvirs "are unfriendly to the knights . . . and are at war with everybody. They are threatening the Roscian law (giving certain privileges to the knights) and even the corn law. . . . Men cannot endure what it seems they must endure. The whole people now have one voice, but it expresses hate rather than power." Again he complains (*Att.* ii. 20) that the state is dying of a new disease, but though there is universal discontent and indignation, nothing is done. "For we do not think that we can resist without a massacre, nor see any result of submission except ruin." Toward the end of July he wrote (*Att.* ii. 21): "The whole commonwealth has perished, and things are worse than when you left in that then a despotism was oppressing the state which was popular with the multitude, and, though offensive to the conservatives, was not doing serious mischief. Now it has suddenly become so universally hated that I shudder to think of what may happen." The position of Pompey he describes in these words: "And so that friend of ours, not used to being unpopular and accustomed to praise and an aureole of glory, disfigured in body and broken in spirit, does not know what to do: he sees that to go on is dangerous, to retreat a sign of vacillation, he has the conservatives as enemies and the mob itself is not friendly." Further on in the same letter he says that the triumvirs "feel that they do not possess the good will of any

¹⁶ The *Ludi Apollinares*, celebrated July 6-13.

party. From which circumstance we have the more reason to fear violence." In the early days of August he tells his friend (*Att.* ii. 22): "I have nothing to write concerning the republic unless it be the intense hate of everyone for those who are the masters of everything. Yet there is no hope of a change."

If we conclude from such passages that Caesar was able to overawe the senate and to defy public opinion because he had an army at hand, we have in this situation an explanation of Pompey's later policy. In 50 B. C. we learn from the letters of Caelius Rufus to Cicero (*Fam.* viii. 11. 14) that Pompey was then fully resolved not to permit Caesar to become consul again until he had given up his provinces and his army. A second consulship Pompey was willing to concede; why, then, did he insist on this particular point? Because, if Caesar remained in Gaul until the time came for him to take up his duties in Rome, he could, under the pretext of a triumph, bring a strong body of soldiers to the gates of the city and do in 48 what he had done in 59. To realize this possibility Pompey had only to recall his own performance in 71-70. If Caesar was forced to give up his *imperium* he would become consul without the support of an army and might be held in check. It was not the second consulship of Caesar that Pompey dreaded at first, but the repetition of the military dictatorship of 59.

AN ANCIENT *BON VIVANT*¹

By ARTHUR PATCH MCKINLAY
University of California at Los Angeles

Barrett Wendell in his *Traditions of European Literature* (p. 195) says that Cicero was reported to be the best diner-out of his times. It is the purpose of this paper to examine the import of this remark. The development of the topic is naturally by definition, for it will be necessary to determine what is meant by the term, *diner-out*. Was Cicero a genuine *bon vivant*, or was he something quite different? In organizing this study the writer will first marshal the facts that corroborate the epicurean interpretation of Professor Wendell's citation and then he will present those that make against such a view. The data on either side will be set forth under two categories: what Cicero said, and what Cicero did that is pertinent to the question at issue.

First, let us take up the evidence that Cicero was a merry old soul. Turning to his works we find an occasional remark that may confirm this interpretation. We all remember the *locus classicus* from the *De Senectute* (46) in which Cicero's mouth-piece, Cato, expresses his delight in protracted banquets, in drinking-bouts, and in the passing of beaded cups. Cato is also made to give daily dinners to which he invites the neighbors. Then there is that continued correspondence with a jolly good fellow by the name of Paetus. Here are some samples:

Now for your joking. What is this you say about inviting me to dine off fish chowder? Formerly my compliance was so great that I put up with such thrift on your part. Now the situation is changed.

¹ Read at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Pacific States, July 1, 1926, University of California, Berkeley, California. The translations are taken from *Letters of a Roman Gentleman*, by Arthur Patch McKinlay, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1926.

I have Hirtius and Dolabella as pupils in oratory and instructors in dining. No doubt, if the news reaches your ears, you have heard that these *bons vivants* are taking lessons in public speaking with me, I in cookery with them. Therefore, it won't do you any good to have gone into bankruptcy. Formerly when you had property, questions of petty profit held your attention; now, since you bear your losses with resignation, there is no reason that in setting me up a good dinner you should view the expense in any other light than that of an account gone bad; such a blow from a friend is lighter to bear than from a debtor.

I don't demand a repast so extravagant that there be much left over. Let what there be, be of high grade and in good taste. I should like to see the man brave enough to carry out your threat of setting before me a boiled squid red as the face of the rouged Jove. Believe me, you will not dare to do it; for before I come, you will have heard of my newly found elegance; you will be in dread of it. You needn't count on serving your usual relish; I've sworn off on eggs, olives, and sausages; they used to make me ill (*Fam.* ix. 16).

Again, writing to the same friend, Cicero says:

Last, or perhaps you would say "First," I have demolished more peacocks than you have squabs. You delight yourself there with the gravity of your lawyer friend Haterius, I here with the gravity of my friend Hirtius. Come, therefore, if you are a man, and take a course in domestic science with me. Although doing so will be like Minerva's going to school to a pig, yet I will guarantee the instruction. In the class you shall have a teaching fellowship and occupy a seat next to me; the instructor's chair will come in good season (*Fam.* ix. 18).

The last social letter — written to the same Paetus — is in a similar vein:

I take it ill that you have stopped going out to dinners; for you have deprived yourself of much delight and pleasure. Besides, I fear — for one may tell the truth — you may unlearn and forget how to give what I may call those *dinnerettes* of yours; for, if you were not much of an adept (at giving dinners) when you had someone to imitate, what am I to expect of you now? Indeed, when I told Spurrinna (the soothsayer who told Caesar to beware the Ides of March) how fond you used to be of dining out and how you had given up

this habit, he pointed out that great danger was in store for the state unless you reverted to your old custom before the spring winds begin to blow; you can be excused for the present if you cannot stand the cold weather (*Fam.* ix. 24).

Here, in the main, is the evidence that would convict Cicero by word of mouth of being a hedonist. This testimony is supported by certain acts of his. First, if he were going to give fashionable dinners he would need a house to match, and so he bought one, as heralded in the following note to Sestius:

Close upon the heels of your letter felicitating me upon the prospect of securing Crassus' house I put through the deal, purchase price 3,500,000 sesterces (\$150,000). Therefore know you that I am in debt enough to make me eager myself to get up a conspiracy; that is, if anyone will take me in. Some of the conspirators (Catiline's friends) exclude me and openly loathe me as the one who put down the plot; others do not trust me and fear me as a spotter and refuse to believe that one who saved the money bags of the bankers can really be short of cash. Still there is plenty of money at six per cent. Besides, thanks to my exploits, I am accounted a good money risk (*Fam.* v. 6).

That this letter may be taken as evidence seems warranted from Clodius' interpretation of Cicero's purchase. The fellow on the floor of the Senate twitted Cicero with having bought a house and coupled the charge with another to the effect that Cicero had been at Baiae,² much as we should accuse a person of having gone to Palm Beach or Havana.

Then again Cicero is found dining with the fast set at Volumnius' house where one of the principal guests was the notorious actress Cytheris.³ But most damaging of all is the following letter to Trebatius in which we find that Cicero actually got tipsy:

You made fun yesterday over our cups because I maintained that the doctors disagreed over a *certain point of law*. Accordingly, although I got home pretty well muddled and rather late, I took a note of the chapter in which the question is discussed; and having

² *Att.* i. 16.

³ *Fam.* ix. 26.

copied it out, I am sending it to you that you may know that Sextus Aelius, Manius Manilius, and Marcus Brutus all hold that view which you denied was ever maintained by anyone (*Fam.* vii. 22).

The preceding note is only one of a voluminous correspondence with this same Trebatius. If we are to judge a man by the company he keeps, we may argue that this was not the first time that Cicero drank too much with his young friend; for Trebatius was evidently a devotee of the cup; many years later we find him represented as advising Horace to drench himself in wine that he might throw off insomnia.⁴

This is about all the evidence we can gather from Cicero's words and deeds that could convict him of being an Epicurean. We find that he was inordinately fond of banquets, that very occasionally he mingled with the fast set, and that he wrote humorous letters about his gustatory feats — not much basis for writing him down as a high-liver.

In fact, there is definite and clinching testimony to the contrary. In writing about the dinner at which the actress Cytheris was present Cicero felt constrained to make excuses for being in such company.⁵ He implies that he would not have gone if he had known that she were to be there, and he goes on to say that even as a young man he took no interest in loose women and no more now that he had become old. Now, from time immemorial wine and women have been supposed to go together. Following out the argument, we may well conclude that Cicero cared for one as little as for the other.

For further evidence we may adduce the famous letter to Gallus. It seems that he had purchased some statuary for Cicero. The consignment contained an example of Mars and some Bacchic dancers. In the letter Cicero agrees to the transaction but plans immediately to dispose of his acquisition on the ground that such subjects were not appropriate to him and his house. He writes:

I had barely got in from Arpinum when your letter (regarding the

⁴ *Hor. Serm.* ii. 1.

⁵ *Fam.* ix. 26.

statues) arrived. The whole affair would be easy to handle if you had bought what I wanted. I ratify the transaction, however, and am gratified to do so; for I well appreciate not only the zeal but also the love that actuated you when you bought what you thought worthy of me. But I hope that Damasippus will stick to his offer of taking over your bargain; for, the fact is, I have no use for it. You compare the Bacchae of your purchase with the Muses of Metellus. Wherein does the similarity consist? Such an acquisition as his, it is true, would be suitable to a library and would harmonize with my studies; but where at my house is there a place for Bacchae? (*Fam.* vii. 23).

These citations reveal Cicero as a good-liver in practice but a simple one in theory. Does the contradiction betray the inconsistency characteristic of human frailty or can the two points of view be reconciled? To tell the truth, by way of answer, it was not eating and drinking but social intercourse that lured Cicero to the dining-hall. The evidence for this statement is overwhelming. Again we go to his words and acts for data. In the *De Senectute* (46), when he speaks of protracted banquets, drinking-bouts, and neighborhood gatherings, it is social intercourse that is uppermost in his thoughts. In writing of his dinner with Cytheris he says: "I like a dinner party. I talk freely there on whatever subject comes up and convert sighs into loud bursts of laughter."⁶ In the letters to Paetus where Cicero expatiates on his high living, on closer inspection his protestations prove to be only a pose to cover his political sorrows.⁷

In one of these Cicero lays down the principle that actuated him in his social life as follows:

But my dear Paetus, laying all joking aside, I advise you to consort with men merry and good; there is nothing in life more fit, nothing better suited for happy living. It is not pleasure that I have in mind but living and eating together and that relaxation of the spirit which is best brought about by familiar discourse. Conversation is the most charming thing about banquets (*convivia*), a term that we use more wisely than the Greeks; for they talk about sym-

⁶ *Fam.* ix. 26.

⁷ *Fam.* ix. 24.

posia and *syndeipna*, that is *eatings* and *drinkings together*; whereas we speak of *convivia*, *livings together*, because then most of all do we live together (*Fam.* ix. 24).

This same principle is set forth in almost identical words in the *De Senectute* (45).

This ideal of friendly intercourse is complemented in Cicero's regime with one of simple living. In writing of his dinner with Cytheris he says that it is his practice to dine well within the provisions of the sumptuary law.⁸ In the *De Senectute* (56) he lauds the simple fare of country life. While joking with Paetus about his sumptuous repasts, he suddenly breaks off with "Enough of this! I'll come on your own terms. Nay, to relieve your mind, you may go back to your old menu of cheese and fish."⁹ Or again, he announces to Paetus his imminent arrival in the following words:

Yesterday I arrived at Cumae; tomorrow, perhaps, I shall be with you; when I am sure, I will give you due, if short, notice. Marcus Caeparius, on meeting me in the forest of Gallinaria and being asked how you were, said you were abed with an attack of the gout. I was sorry to hear of your indisposition; still I decided to go to you that I might get a glimpse of you, make you a visit, and even dine with you. I don't suppose that your cook has the gout also. Therefore be looking for a guest with a light appetite and a great antipathy for sumptuous dinners (*Fam.* ix. 23).

Once, however, Cicero's confidence in simple fare got him into trouble and was the occasion of the following complaint to Gallus:

When I had been severely ill for ten days and when, because of having no fever, I could not persuade my clients of my indisposition, I fled for refuge to my villa here (Tusculum). Meanwhile I fasted so thoroughly that for two days I did not taste even water; for I feared that my trouble might be dysentery. But thanks to the change of locality, or relaxation of mind, or, perchance, the abating of the disease through lapse of time, I seem better.

That you may not wonder whence the attack came or what law of

⁸ *Fam.* ix. 26.

⁹ *Fam.* ix. 16.

hygiene I violated, it is the regulations in regard to the high cost of living that played a trick on me; for your Epicurean friends, wishing to popularize the use of garden herbs that are exempted from the provisions of the law, prepare mushrooms, mallows, and all kinds of greens so well that nothing could be more appetizing. When I had fallen upon such a mess at a dinner in honor of Lentulus' appointment to the augurate, such a violent attack of indigestion seized me that today only is there the first sign of its letting up; and so I, who was easily resisting the allurements of oysters and other such dainties, got taken in by a beet and a mallow. The next time I shall be more cautious, I assure you (*Fam.* vii. 26).

Barring such a mischance as recorded in the previous letter, Cicero's devotion to plain fare does not seem to have interfered with his desire to be the life of a dinner party. The young bloods of the town flocked to his table to hear his *bons mots*.¹⁰ Caesar called for a report of his witty sayings along with the news of the day.¹¹ Trebonius brought out an edition of these witticisms.¹² On one of these occasions Cicero reports that there was a great play of words till the day was about played out.¹³ The most famous of all was the time Cicero entertained Caesar himself. The letter is worth quoting at length:

What a fearsome guest! and yet I do not regret his visit, for it was very delightful. On the second day of the winter holidays he put up at the villa of Octavius' stepfather, Philippus. The company so packed the establishment that there was hardly a place for Caesar to dine in; two thousand men there were. You may be sure that I was disturbed as to the morrow; but Barba Cassius came to my relief; he posted guards, made camp in the fields, and protected my villa.

Caesar stayed with Philippus until noon of the next day; nobody was admitted to his presence; no doubt, he was going over his accounts with Balbus. Then (coming to Cicero's) he took a walk on the seashore; at one o'clock a bath. He next took a rub down in

¹⁰ *Fam.* ix. 16.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Fam.* xv. 21.

¹³ *Att.* xiii. 9.

oil, after which he dined. Since he was undergoing a course of emetics, he ate and drank without fear and with pleasure. The dinner was well got up, and not only that but it was well cooked and well seasoned; the conversation was delightful; and to take it all in all, everything went off agreeably. Besides, in three rooms Caesar's suite was entertained very bountifully. The ordinary attendants and the slaves had all they wanted; the more fashionable guests were served right elegantly. In fact, I showed off as a good provider.

As for my guest, he is not one to whom one would say: "Pray, my good fellow, on your way back stop off again with me." Once is enough. The talk avoided politics but fell much on literary topics. In short, he was in a charming and agreeable mood. He was to spend one day at Puteoli and another at Baiae. There you have an account of his visit, or shall I say his billeting, which, though it brought me some trouble, as I have said, occasioned me little annoyance (*Att.* xiii. 52).

In this informal study of Cicero as a diner-out it has been the purpose of the writer to catch him off his guard, to find out whether he really practiced what he preached. A more formal treatment of what he thought as a philosopher might be undertaken. One might refer to his fling at Epicureanism in the *De Senectute* (43) as being subversive of military morale, or cite the derisory tone, displayed in his letter to Memmius,¹⁴ toward the sect as being beneath the notice of a Roman, or review the discussion in the *De Finibus* (Book ii) where Cicero rejects the Epicurean position as being an untenable philosophy. But time fails; and besides, further words would be superfluous, for the preceding array of citations and excerpts shows what interpretation we must put on the statement that Cicero was the best diner-out of his times. We find that he held before himself the ideal of simple and friendly living and that with singular consistency he held to this ideal.

¹⁴ *Fam.* xiii. 1.

NAUKRATIS AND HER HINTERLAND

By E. MARION SMITH
Hollins College, Virginia

In the ever increasing study of the expansion of Hellas, certainly one of the most neglected phases of the subject has been the relations existing between the Greek colonists sent out by the mother-states and the native population amid which these colonists made their new homes. It is the belief of Professor R. J. Bonner, in an article in the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL*,¹ in which he centers his argument about the Hellenic settlements along the south shore of the Pontus, that these relations were decidedly limited. And in the case of Naukratis, the Greek colony in Egypt, they appear to have been scarcely more extended.

Naukratis was a colony which was founded probably shortly before the accession of Psammetichus I (664 B.C.) by Milesian traders who worked their way into the Delta, first establishing a trading-post τὸ Μιλησίων τεῖχος on the Bolbitic arm of the Nile, and a little later, Naukratis on the Canobic arm.² It was not long, however, until these Milesians at Naukratis were joined by Ionian Greek and Carian mercenaries, who, according to Herodotus (ii. 152), had left their own country on a voyage of plunder and had been carried to Egypt by bad weather. They appeared opportunely at a time when Psammetichus I was trying to subjugate eleven opposing petty chieftains among whom the Delta had temporarily been divided; and, since the native troops were badly demoralized by poverty and disorder, he gladly received them into his service. It was through their efforts that Psammetichus finally succeeded in overcoming his adversaries and in establish-

¹ March, 1925, pp. 359 ff., "Greek Colonies and the Hinterland."

² Smith, *Naukratis, A Chapter in the History of the Hellenisation of Egypt* (Vienna, 1926), pp. 15 ff.

ing himself as the first king of the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty, which had its capital at Saïs.

If we accept the authority of Strabo,³ the majority of the Egyptians were always intensely jealous of Greek settlers. Psammetichus I, however, in a measure departed from this rule. When he came to the throne, he divided the Greek mercenaries, with whose aid he had established himself, between Defenneh, on the Pelusiac arm of the Nile, and Naukratis, thus forming on the east a protection against the incursions of the Syrians and on the west a guard against the inroads of the Libyans; and, in return for the aid which they had rendered him, the Greeks at Naukratis enjoyed his political backing. Diodorus (i. 66. 8) tells us that during his reign the Phoenicians and Hellenes were especially favored in the matter of trade, and he calls Psammetichus a philhellene. At this time Greeks served in the royal guard, and probably no military expedition was undertaken without the aid of Greek mercenaries.⁴

Necho continued the policy of his predecessor in regard to the Greeks and depended upon his Greek mercenaries to secure his power abroad and at home. That he employed Greek mercenaries in his invasion of Syria in 608 B.C. is shown by the fact that he consecrated the armor in which he fought at Megiddo to Apollo⁵ and sent it to his temple at Branchidae.⁶ However, in 605 B.C., when Necho was defeated by Nebuchadnezzar at Carchemish, we have no indication of the participation of Greeks.⁷

The successor of Necho, Psammetichus II, when he made his expedition to the Sudan, led his Greek mercenaries in person. It was no doubt on this occasion that they carved their names on the leg of one of the colossal statues of Rameses II at Abu Simbel, where they may still be read.⁸

There followed a struggle for power between the successor of

³ Strabo (Did.) xvii, p. 673.

⁴ Quibell, *Some Notes on Egyptian History and Art*, p. 136.

⁵ Herodotus ii. 159.

⁶ Rawlinson, *History of Ancient Egypt*, p. 85.

⁷ Jeremiah 46: 2.

⁸ K. T. Frost, *J. H. S.*, 1913, pp. 189 ff.

Psammetichus II, Apries, and one of his own commanders, Amasis, in which the former was killed. This seems, if we are to judge from the apparent cessation of the manufacture of scarabs at Naukratis at this time,⁹ to have caused a temporary disruption of business for the colony — a thing not to be wondered at, since Apries levied thirty thousand Greek mercenaries to aid him, and these were defeated. Amasis, once he had secured his power, in spite of the fact that he had established himself with the aid of the Egyptians, realized that he must cultivate the friendship of the Greeks, who had been the main strength of his opponent, Apries. He accordingly abandoned the traditional Egyptian prejudice against the Greeks,¹⁰ and openly set about seeking their support.¹¹ This change in attitude was manifest in several ways. He contracted a friendship and an alliance with the Greeks of Cyrene, and took as a secondary wife a Greek woman, a native of Cyrene, whose name was Ladice;¹² removed the Ionians and Carians who had been living at Defenneh to Memphis and made them his bodyguard against the Egyptians;¹³ and allied himself with Croesus¹⁴ and Polycrates of Samos.¹⁵ As a further proof of his good will toward the Greeks, Amasis dedicated offerings in Greek lands. In the first place, he sent to Cyrene a statue of Athene covered with plates of gold, and a painted portrait of himself; secondly, to Athena of Lindos he gave two statues made of stone and a linen corselet; and thirdly, to Hera of Samos he gave two images of himself carved in wood.¹⁶ He also showed favor to individual Greeks. We know from Herodotus (i. 30) that Solon visited the court of Amasis, and Plato¹⁷ says that the Athenian lawgiver was honorably received there.

⁹ Petrie, *Naukratis*, I, p. 5.

¹⁰ Maspero, *The Passing of the Empires*, pp. 496 f.

¹¹ Sayce, *The Egypt of the Hebrews and Herodotus*, pp. 131 f.

¹² Herodotus ii. 181.

¹³ *Ibid.*, ii. 154.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, i. 77.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, iii. 39-40.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, ii. 182.

¹⁷ *Timaeus*, p. 21 e.

Though a philhellene, Amasis did not wish Greek influence in Egypt to be too widely spread. He accordingly passed an edict restricting and concentrating the Greeks in Egypt at Naukratis, and with this measure the colony entered upon its most prosperous period. Until then its traders had been mainly Milesian, though there is both literary and archaeological evidence that there were some Cyprians,¹⁸ Aeginetans,¹⁹ and Samians²⁰ on the site before the beginning of the sixth century. After the decree of Amasis, however, Naukratis had to receive Greeks from every side. Strict laws were made forbidding any other settlement of Greeks in Egypt and the trading of Greeks in other places there.²¹ Rhodians, Ionians, Dorians, and Aeolians from other parts of Egypt arrived, therefore, at Naukratis.²² This was of material advantage to the commerce of the settlement,²³ and during the reign of Amasis,²⁴ it flourished on its monopoly of Greek trade.

The colony was well located to carry on trade with the interior of the Delta. Situated on the Canobic branch of the Nile, she had easy access to the Mediterranean, and provided a direct waterway to Memphis. From a recently published papyrus fragment²⁵ we learn that the colony lay on the overland route from Pelusium to Canobus, which passed through Heracleopolis, Bubastis, and Hermupolis. By the Canobic arm and a canal Naukratis had direct communication with Saïs and the capital of the kings of the Twenty-Sixth Dynasty. She further commanded the rich alluvial fan of the Delta with its abundant crops, and furnished an opportunity for trading in Egyptian corn.²⁶ She did not herself have considerable surrounding territory,²⁷ a thing in which she appears

¹⁸ Athenaeus xv. 18.

¹⁹ Herodotus ii. 178.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Herodotus ii. 179.

²² *Ibid.*, ii. 178.

²³ Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Pubblicazioni delle Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto*, Vol. V, no. 543.

²⁶ Mallet, *Les Établissements des Grecs en Égypte*, p. 282.

²⁷ Gwynn, *J. H. S.*, 1918, p. 106.

to be different from the general run of Greek colonies. However, a large amount of Egyptian grain must have passed through her port to the shores of Asia Minor, the islands of the Aegean, and Greece. Egypt, in the vicinity of Naukratis, was rich in other products which could be exported. Such were salt, natron, alum, alabaster, precious metals, papyrus, and linen, all of which must have been handled by Naukratite merchants.

The excavations at Naukratis tend to prove that there was an Egyptian settlement on the southern half of the mound at the time when the Milesians first came there. The Egyptians apparently did not allow the Greeks to settle on a site exclusively their own, and these new colonists settled a little above them to the north. With these Egyptians who occupied the adjoining land to the south the Greeks at Naukratis seem to have had only a limited intercourse, apart from trade. From Herodotus (ii. 154) we learn that Psammetichus I entrusted to the care of the Greeks certain Egyptian children, to whom they were to teach the Greek language. These children, says Herodotus, so instructed, became the parents of the entire class of interpreters in Egypt. From this Leroux²⁸ concludes that the Greeks at Naukratis freely intermarried with the indigenous population. This is in accord with Mahaffy's view²⁹ that in the Ptolemaic period Naukratis had become a "mere Egyptian town." However, it is much more likely that these interpreters were simply intermediaries between the Greeks and the Egyptians in matters of business. Herodotus (ii. 9) says that the Egyptians shunned Greek customs, from which we may possibly conclude that they did not intermarry with the Greeks. In a papyrus³⁰ which has come down to us from Roman times, there is the statement that the Greeks had no ἐπὶ γαμία with the Egyptians. Since the fact is mentioned in this papyrus of the Roman period, the population of Naukratis would seem to have preserved its Greek character³¹ until very late. There

²⁸ *L'Hellenisation du Monde Antique*, pp. 102 ff.

²⁹ *The Empire of the Ptolemies*, p. 81.

³⁰ *P. Compt. R. de l'Acad.*, 1905, 27.

³¹ Mitteis-Wilcken, *Papyruskunde*, I, p. 13.

is, however, in the Cairo Museum, a huge statue, Egyptian in workmanship, which bears on the back of it a hieroglyphic inscription which says that the statue represents an Egyptian named Horemheb. His father's name, Kards, must have been Greek, and, if so, this would imply intermarriage. There is also the fact that aside from Archias,³² who describes five women with Greek names and characterizes them as "the women who dwell in the hollows of Naukratis," we have no references to women at Naukratis apart from courtesans.³³

In religion Naukratis held herself aloof from her Egyptian neighbors, each new group of Greeks who came either founding a temple of its own to the patron deity of its mother-state, or taking a share in the Hellenion, a common sanctuary built after the edict of Amasis. Naukratis also retained her own laws and her own system of government, with one possible exception when Horemheb, if we are to believe the hieroglyphic inscription to which I have referred above, "had charge" of the Greek colony at Naukratis. But there is no other evidence for an Egyptian governor. It was the custom of every Greek colony to maintain close relations with the mother-city, and these bonds seem to have been especially strong in the case of Naukratis. She seems to have cared little to extend her rule over her barbarian neighbors or to mingle with them in any way other than in matters of business.

³² *Palatine Anthology* (Loeb) vi. 207.

³³ Herodotus ii. 134-5; Aelian xii. 63.

Notes

[All contributions in the form of notes for this department should be sent direct to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.]

WALTER LEAF

BORN 1852 AND DIED MARCH 8, 1927

In the passing of this kindly and modest man the world of finance and of letters loses one of its most conspicuous figures. There seems to have been hardly any honor in the world of business that was not his: Chairman of the London Chamber of Commerce, President of the International Chamber of Commerce, President of the Institute of Bankers, and Chairman of the London County, Westminster, and Parr's Bank. During the World War he was Chairman of the Committee on Finance for the British Empire. He was President of The Hellenic Society and for many years its chief supporter.

Even during the War he prepared a steady stream of books, two of which are his famous *Homer and History* and *Strabo On The Troad*.

His translation of the *Iliad* has had a great and steady sale, while his recent *History of Banking* had the honor of being England's best seller in 1926.

In his more than a dozen books and certainly more than one hundred articles he has covered a wide range of Greek and Latin studies.

Doctor Leaf was the intimate friend of such men as Tennyson and Matthew Arnold, and it may well be doubted if any person of our age has had so wide a circle of friends in so many fields.

Those who knew him well forget their admiration for the scholar and the financier in their affection for the unassuming and unselfish gentleman.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

DIODORUS AND HOMER

Few writers of ancient Greek have preserved such vast, varied, and valuable material as Diodorus of Sicily, a younger contemporary of Cicero. Among this material is no less a treasure than the verses composed by Simonides in honor of Leonidas and his warriors who fell at Thermopylae.

Homer is for him "the poet," and that designation, when unexplained, applies to him alone. He writes "the poet Hesiod," "the poet Aeschylus," and in the same way of many others; but although he says fourteen times "the poet says," or some kindred expression, the quotation given is invariably from our Homer. Sometimes he adds some such phrase as "the earliest and most admired of poets," "the most illustrious poet among the Greeks," or "the earliest and greatest of poets."

There are thirty-nine quotations or direct references to Homer, generally preceded by the words "as Homer says," or as "the poet says," but sometimes the authorship is taken for granted and no indication of the source is given. The disputed verses of the eleventh and twenty-fourth books of the *Odyssey* are quoted or paraphrased as if their Homeric authorship was unquestioned.

In all this bulk of writing, far more than the combined length of the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides, and in all this wealth of literary allusions there is not a single reference to Homer as the author of the Epic Cycle, or any part of it, except the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It seems hard to believe that the Cycle could then have been referred to Homer and no hint of that reference been given by Diodorus.

The phrase in Homer that has caused as much discussion as any other and about which the Homeric Question long revolved is the *λυγρὰ σήματα*, "baneful signs," of Z 168. These words had no difficulties for Diodorus, since he retells in prose the story of Bellerophon and the secret orders he carried to Iobates of Lycia, Book vi. 9. 1. In this he says that Bellerophon bore "writings," *γράμματα*, and that when Iobates opened "the letter," *ἐπιστολήν*, he found orders to slay Bellerophon.

Diodorus placed the death of Homer earlier than the Dorian Invasion, hence considerably before the date given by Herodotus.

The opinions of this writer regarding Homer are of little moment

in themselves, except that he does show the small importance of the poems of the Epic Cycle when compared with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Also the fact that he never assigns any of them to Homer is strong evidence that they were not regarded as Homeric in the first century B.C.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

THE ORIGIN OF THE MYTH OF THE GOLDEN FLEECE

Strabo in his description of the regions that lie between Armenia and the Caucasus Mountains says: "The rivers bring down bits of gold which the natives gather by means of troughs pierced with holes and with pelts of sheep covered with long wool; hence arose the tradition of the fleece of gold" (xii. 2. 19).

Gibbon, in picturing the wealth of the precious metal carried by the streams near the Phasis, that is, below and beyond Trebizond, writes: "The waters impregnated with particles of gold are carefully strained through sheepskins or fleeces, the groundwork, perhaps, of the marvellous fable" (*Decline and Fall*, XLII, 372, in Bury's edition).

I have the word of a traveller from upper Asia Minor and also from a mining engineer that even today in these very same districts fleeces are fastened to the bottom of streams in places where these streams are shallow, and that the gold-bearing sands drop their gold in the wool. When these fleeces are thus loaded they are carried to a primitive furnace and burned, and the gold is then easily and fully recovered.

It is a little hard to grasp the exact process hinted at by either Strabo or Gibbon, but this last one is very simple and seems to furnish just the basis needed for the myth, if such a basis is necessary.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Current Events

[Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass., for territory covered by the Associations of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States east of the Mississippi River; George Howe, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, for the Southeastern States; Walter Miller, the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the Southwestern States; and Franklin H. Potter, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, for the territory of the Association west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. News from the Pacific Coast may be sent to Miss Julianne A. Roller, Franklin High School, Portland, Ore., and to Mr. Walter A. Edwards, Los Angeles High School, Los Angeles, Cal. This department will present everything that is properly news—but considerations of space compel the editors to ask that items be made as brief as possible.]

Hugh Macmaster Kingery

Hugh Macmaster Kingery, Professor Emeritus of Wabash College, died at the home of his son in Denver on February 21. He was professor of Latin in the College of Emporia, 1884-1891, and in Wabash College, 1891-1916. He edited the *Medea of Seneca*, *Three Tragedies of Seneca*, *Selected Orations and Letters of Cicero*, and *Selected Letters of Pliny*. He was an able man, a scholar, and a good friend of the Association and of the JOURNAL.

Conference of the Latin Teachers of Iowa

The Ninth Annual Conference of the Latin Teachers of Iowa was held at Iowa City on February 11 and 12. The attendance was almost twice as large as last year. Among the guests of the Conference were Dean S. E. Stout, of Indiana University, and Dr. Keith Preston, Literary Editor of the Chicago Daily News. An especially interesting feature of the program was an original Latin playlet, *Talassio*, written by Mrs. W. F. Bristol, based on Livy i.9, and performed by a cast of undergraduates. A large and interesting Latin Laboratory was made possible by exhibits sent in from all parts of the state. The program of papers was as follows:

FRIDAY MORNING

"A Study of Terence's Prologues," Roy C. Flickinger; "The *Lysistrata* of Aristophanes," William Benson; "Facility in the Reading of Greek," Edward

B. Spencer; "Progress of the American School at Athens" (illustrated), William S. Ebersole; "Clemenceau and Demosthenes," Keith Preston.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON

"With Cicero as Model," Louisa V. Walker; "The Teacher's Crowning Task," Clara Berdan; "The Development of Speed in Reading Latin," S. E. Stout; "Selling Latin," Joseph S. Magnuson; "Preparation and Use of Laboratory Material," Effie E. Mullin; "What the Extension Division Can Do for Latin Teachers," Claud O. Higbee; "*Talassio*," an original Latin playlet by Mrs. W. F. Bristol; "The Descent into Avernus," a film in two reels.

DINNER SESSION

Benedictio ante Cenam, Father William Shannahan; Greeting and Welcome, President Walter A. Jessup; Readings from Original Poems, Keith Preston.

FRIDAY EVENING

"From Manuscript to Printed Book in the Fifteenth Century" (illustrated), S. E. Stout.

SATURDAY MORNING

"Training the Student to Read Alone," Franklin H. Potter; "The Roman Private Soldier," S. E. Stout; "Objectives in the Study of Vergil," Frank J. Miller; Round Table: New Text Books in Latin, Helen May Eddy, *in charge*; "An Introduction to Some of the New Elementary Texts," Maisy B. Schreiner; "Prose Composition — When? How? Why?" Hattie E. Greenhow; "Martial and Literary Criticism," Keith Preston; "The New Minoan Collection at the State University" (illustrated), Roy C. Flickinger.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON

"A Demonstration of Teaching Pupils to Read in the Latin Word Order," Helen May Eddy, and pupils from the University High School.

Eastern Massachusetts Section of the Classical Association

More than a hundred members attended the twentieth annual meeting of the Eastern Massachusetts Section of the Classical Association of New England, which met in joint session with the Classical Club of Greater Boston, at Cambridge, on February 5. The program was as follows:

"A Word of Welcome," Alice Walton, President of the Section; "Classics and the Study of Our Native Literature," Kenneth B. Murdock, Harvard University; "The Dido of History and the Dido of the *Aeneid*," Blanche Brotherton, Mount Holyoke College; "Some Tests in Latin Teaching" (illustrated), Florence Waterman, the Winsor School, Boston; "Venetian Sites in Greece" (illustrated), Stephen B. Luce, Boston; "Crete Revisited" (illustrated), Mrs. Harriet Boyd Hawes, Wellesley College.

Officers for 1927-1928: President, Albert S. Perkins, Dorchester

High School; Secretary, Clarence W. Gleason, Roxbury Latin School; Executive Committee: Edward H. Atherton, Boston; Donald Cameron, Boston University; Arthur W. Roberts, Brookline High School; Fred B. Lund, Boston; William Denison, Tufts College.

The Sather Lectures

The Sather Lectures on Classical Literature, of the University of California, are given this year by John L. Myres, Fellow of New College and Wykeham Professor of Ancient History in Oxford University. The series of eight lectures is given between February 16 and April 13. The general subject of the course is "Who Were the Greeks?" The subjects of the individual lectures are: "Criteria of Nationality: common abode"; "Common Descent: tested by physical anthropology"; "Common Language: tested by comparative philology"; "Common Beliefs: tested by comparative religion"; "Common Culture: tested by prehistoric archaeology"; "Descent, Language, Beliefs, and Culture in the Light of Folk-Memory"; "The Crucible and the Mould"; "The Making of a Nation."

Summer Session in Rome

The membership of the Fifth Summer Session of the School of Classical Studies in Rome has been limited to 60. There are still a number of places. The enrollment at this writing represents 16 states, the District of Columbia, and Canada. The wideness of its distribution is indicated by the presence on the roll of Louisiana, California, Colorado, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, and Massachusetts. The progressive teacher should not think that a grand tour of many countries is to be preferred to the serious and thorough six weeks' study of the most interesting and inspiring city in the world. The comment last summer was all to the contrary. It is possible, too, to see much of Europe before and after the Summer Session. Detailed information may be obtained from Professor Grant Showerman, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

The Secretary of the Philological Association

Professor Joseph William Hewitt, Secretary and Treasurer of the American Philological Association, will spend next year, his sabbatical year, abroad. His duties as secretary, treasurer, curator, and editor of the Transactions and Proceedings will be assumed for the year by Professor Leroy C. Barrett, of Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut.

Hints for Teachers

[Edited by Victor D. Hill, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. It is the aim of this department to furnish teachers of high-school Latin with material which will be of direct and immediate help in the classroom. Teachers are requested to send to the editor of the department short paragraphs dealing with matters of content, teaching devices, methods, and materials which they have found helpful. Questions regarding teaching problems are also invited. Replies to these will be published in this department if they seem to be of general interest; otherwise they will, so far as possible, be answered by mail. It will, in general, be the policy of this department to publish all such contributions as seem of value and general interest.]

Of Interest Abroad

The excavations going on at Chester, England, and the coming dramatic festival at Delphi will be of especial interest to teachers who are planning a visit to sites of classical tradition in Europe.

EXCAVATIONS AT CHESTER

Chester is the site of the old Roman fortress of Deva, which is thought to have covered, as early as the first century A.D., "something like sixty acres." At that time it provided quarters for the Twentieth Legion (*Valeria Victrix*) and the Second (*Adiutrix Pia Fidelis*). The museum at Chester contains many important finds and others have been removed to London. But unfortunately for archaeological study not only has the modern city been the occasion for quarrying the old Roman buildings but the existing remains are covered except for brief periods when an old building is being replaced by a new one. There is, however, an open pasture of about three acres known as Deanery Field at the northeast angle of the city walls and formerly believed to be outside the walls of the Roman fort. The excavations which Professor Newstead is conducting there are the culmination of investigations made by him since 1910. In 1924-25 the foundations of a whole series of barrack-rooms were uncovered, corresponding to the recognized plan of a large Roman fort. "The two-roomed hutments — each, it is supposed, to accommodate eight men — are arranged in rows, face to face, with a veranda running the length of each row and a lane some sixteen feet wide between the two verandas. In one place nearly ninety feet of wall were exposed." Many military and personal ornaments were found, brooches, pendants and chains, a complete set of the colored counters which the Roman soldier used for gambling, coins, ballista balls and a number of other weapons and tools, knives and writing instruments. In the present excavation there have already been found "remains of Roman barrack blocks, the plan of which is described as more complete than any hitherto explored," as well as numerous smaller finds. Other important

remains are believed to be here "lying under open ground, such as can be found nowhere else in the fort area of Chester, and there can be little doubt that other valuable finds await discovery under the Deanery Field."

THE FESTIVAL AT DELPHI¹

For the two days, May 9 and 10, Delphi is to take on something of the glory of those olden times when the ancient world was wont to visit the oracle and shrine of Apollo, if the plans which have been announced are carried through. According to the printed reports the *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus is to be presented at the ancient theatre, there are to be gymnastic games and choral dances, with the addition of national dances and religious music intended to link the ancient with the modern. Extensive preparations are said to be in progress to make this "Delphic festival" a success and to care for the visitors.

"Among the almost numberless ruins and memorable places of Greece none quite equals Delphi. . . The shrine lies high in the hills, almost in the shadow of Mount Parnassus, beloved of poets. . . The French have excavated Delphi in every known part and its museum contains a number of fine sculptures. The fragments of one building have been restored to their site; the treasury of the Athenians stands in its place today as it did before the destruction of Delphi began; the stadium is well preserved; the theatre is still usable, and there are the ruins of the great temple of Apollo."

A Roman Banquet

A very successful Roman banquet is here described by Miss Fannie Holland, of Western Kentucky Teachers College.

The F. C. G. Classical Club of the Western Kentucky Teachers College at Bowling Green recently gave an unusually attractive program in the form of a banquet prepared and served in the best Roman style. The guests were dressed to represent famous Romans. Vergil was master of ceremonies, and had charge of invoking the gods, blessing the wine, etc. Caesar, Cicero, Horace, and many others prominent in the "grandeur that was Rome" were present.

The guests were seated at a U-shaped table, and were served by Roman slaves. A scroll on which the menu was printed was placed at each plate. The menu itself was purely Roman.

The program consisted of short speeches in Latin and English and Latin songs interspersed throughout the dinner. Perhaps the most interesting feature of the program was the delivery by the Cumaean Sibyl of fateful and weighty prophecies concerning the future of each one present.

The banquet proved highly successful. Throughout the school at large it aroused interest in the Latin Department, affording us a little of the publicity which all Latin departments seem to need. Within the club itself, the program achieved a great deal more, stimulating much interest, and causing some

¹ See also CLASSICAL JOURNAL, December, 1926, p. 224.

rather extensive reading on the subject of Roman customs in general and food and dress in particular.

The total cost was very moderate. Miss Thomas, assistant in the Latin Department, with the help of two or three of the club members, prepared the banquet, thus bringing the cost down to about fifty cents per plate.

Reviewing Forms in Second-Year Latin

Mrs. Marie T. Garo, Ames Senior High School, Ames, Iowa, sends the following suggestion for handling this problem. She says it is "nothing pretentious," but teachers who combine it with a minimum of classroom recitation and blackboard drill will without doubt find it very helpful.

I have been struggling for the last several years with pupils who come to the work of the second year in Latin with poor preparation in forms. The majority of the pupils in nearly every class have this deficiency, yet it is impossible to take sufficient class time to devote to drilling declensions and conjugations. Even if there were time, it is unfair to keep the well-prepared pupils reciting and hearing paradigms, to say nothing of its being unsatisfactory to the teacher. Last year I adopted the method here described. While it is nothing pretentious, I have found it a great help.

No matter how deficient the pupils are, I start them reading Caesar or other connected Latin. They learn forms as they go, by being required to hand in each day several declensions and synopses written out. These papers are easily examined, and the unsatisfactory ones sorted out and returned for correction. After a time the better-prepared students may be excused from this work, and the promise of that is sufficient incentive for care and attention. This device enables a teacher to make up the drill needed by pupils when she has several different grades of preparation represented in the same class. Part — the greatest part — of its value is in its regularity. It can be done every day. Moreover it takes little of the pupils' time and little of the teacher's.

Greek Plays in English

The attention of Classical Teachers has more than once been attracted to the successful rendering of Greek plays in the state of California. An English version of the *Medea* of Euripides will be presented at Occidental College in June. It is of particular interest that this "free rendering" is made conformable to the Greek meters, to be sung in Greek time with dancing accompaniment. The translation has been made for the occasion by Professor W. D. Ward, of the Greek Department of Occidental College, from the text of Earle's edition, 1904. The example printed here is of the third stasimon (lines 824-865).

Strophe

Long years have the children of old Erechtheus' name,
 Sons of gods, with treasure thy palaces filled,
 O sacred land where never a conqueror came.
 Wisdom, like nectar divine in blossoming meadows distilled,
 They quaff with the day, light as the honey bee winging.
 There, with the voice of the holy Muses singing,
 Rose sweet Harmony, fair and golden.

Antistrophe

Cephisus, fair-flowing, in streams that never fail,
 Cypris drew and flung on the desert to sing.
 So say they. Fragrant zephyrs she breathed o'er the vale,
 Zephyrs that softly wing, and sweet as a blossom in spring.
 And aye, with the Loves, roses her tresses entwining —
 Loves upon Wisdom that wait, in tasks refining —
 Came fair Love, with the Loves enfolden.

Strophe

But how shall the city that stands
 Mirrored in hallowed streams,
 Home of exiles lowly —
 Thou slayer of babes — defend thee,
 The guilty among the holy?
 O look on thy murd'rous hands:
 Thy children behold in thy dreams.
 If suppliant forms may bend thee,
 By Earth and the Sun's fair beams,
 Slay not thy children.

Antistrophe

For how hast thou courage to stand,
 Cold as the nightly pall,
 Sword uplifted, fearless,
 The woe of thy babes unheeding?
 Or how can thine eyes be tearless
 When little ones 'neath thy hand,
 Entreating, their murderer call?
 Nay, then, at their anguished pleading,
 All stainless thy hand will fall,
 Saving thy children.

Book Reviews

The Classics. By the RIGHT HON. LORD HEWART OF BURY, Lord Chief Justice of England. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926.

A year and a half ago the prime minister of England appeared at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Great Britain and in a brilliant address explained to the members of the Association what he conceived to be his indebtedness to Greek and Latin studies. This year it was the good fortune of the same association to have as its president the Right Hon. Lord Hewart of Bury, Lord Chief Justice of England, who in his presidential address discussed the indebtedness of "the whole body politic" to the classics. The address, as published by the Manchester University Press, makes a thin volume of thirty-three pages. It is written in the judicial tone that we should expect from a lord chief justice, and with that elegance of diction that we should expect from an eminent classicist. It is a plea that, in our desire to be creative, we should not "begin where the cave man began." It is a frank recognition of the fact that there is no training ground superior to the classics, if one is seeking to be orderly in his thought processes, and that no other literature has more power to quicken the creative impulse than the literature of ancient Greece. Perhaps an educationalist could not understand many of the imponderable values which are discussed in the address; nevertheless he might take notice when the Lord Chief Justice says that "Latin and Greek have afforded the training of nearly all the best minds in Europe" — a training not merely in style, but a training in character as well — a training that results in that "profound self-dissatisfaction" which is the root of high endeavor, and which also, paradoxically enough, brings great joys to console and comfort when years bring an increased appreciation of the complexity of life.

There are many quotable sentences and paragraphs that will warm the heart of the teacher of the classics. It is not the desire of the reviewer, however, to furnish so full an account of the little book

that one will be less inclined to possess it for himself. But there is one sentence about Latin Prose that must be quoted: ". . . the value of Latin Prose as an instrument of education — that subtle and testing exercise which, while it demands not only grammatical accuracy but also literary knowledge and imagination, compels a person even against his will to be perfectly honest with his own mind, never imagining or persuading himself that he understands or can express what he has only half thought out."

CHARLES N. SMILEY

CARLETON COLLEGE

The Mind of Rome. Contributions by CYRIL BAILEY, J. BELL, J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, T. F. HIGHAM, A. N. BRYAN-BROWN, H. E. BUTLER, MAURICE PLATNAUER, CHARLES SINGER. Edited by CYRIL BAILEY. Illustrated. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1926. Pp. xii + 515. \$3.50.

Readings from the Literature of Ancient Rome in English Translations. By DORA PYM. 8 illustrations and 1 map. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1925. Pp. 332. \$1.60.

Among the numerous books on classical subjects that have appeared in recent years designed particularly to serve the needs and desires of those who know small Latin and less Greek, several produced by the Oxford Press are especially noteworthy. *The Legacy of Greece* and *The Legacy of Rome* give expert presentations, in essay form, of various phases of ancient life and achievement. Now *The Mind of Rome* comes to join *The Pageant of Greece* in presenting to English readers in their own tongue, as well as that limitation allows, fleeting glimpses of the best to be found in the classical literatures. Both of these last-named books serve the same general purpose in their respective fields. Yet in two important particulars they differ.

In the first place the arrangement is different. Whereas the *Pageant* is built on a pattern that is primarily chronological, so that all the works of a particular writer are treated in one section of the book, *The Mind of Rome* is laid out strictly according to types of literature; "each section is designed to show the historical development of its particular branch" (Preface, p. v). A glance at the Table of Contents will make this arrangement clear. The book is divided into three parts — Verse, Verse and Prose, Prose. Under Verse we have sections on Epic, Lyrics and Occasional Verse, Didactic Poetry, Elegiac,

Drama, and Bucolic; under Verse and Prose there are sections on Story-Telling and the Novel, Satire, Letter-Writing, and Literary Criticism; under Prose there are History, Oratory, Philosophy, and Science. This means, necessarily, that in some cases the works of one writer will be found scattered among several sections of the book. Thus, to cite the extreme instance, Vergil is quoted in all the sections under Part I (Verse) except that on the Drama. Ovid, Lucretius, and Apuleius each appear in three different sections, Horace and Cicero in four. (It should be noted, however, that these separated passages are brought into some connection with one another by a generous use of cross references.) Such an arrangement has obvious advantages and disadvantages, as the editor is aware (page 7). Only the use to which the book is to be put will determine which are the greater. The teacher who is seeking a book for use as a text in a course of Latin literature in translation will probably not find this arrangement altogether according to his taste. It is likely, too, that he will be discouraged from using *The Mind of Rome* by the brevity of the passages cited. On the other hand the student of modern literature who is desirous of tracing a particular *genre* back to its classical roots will find this book, arranged as it is, of real interest and value. Even the classically trained reader can derive from it very considerable profit.

In another particular the book under review differs from *The Pageant of Greece*. The latter was edited by one man; the former is the work of eight scholars under the general editorship of Cyril Bailey. This composite workmanship, quite naturally, has occasioned a loss in uniformity of treatment. The writer of each section had to conform to the common scheme of introducing appropriate passages and prefacing them with pertinent explanatory remarks. But within the limits of that scheme he might follow his own bent to a large extent. Thus, the sections on Drama and Literary Criticism, both by J. G. Barrington-Ward, are much more penetrating and detailed than the others, and will serve the scholar much more than the general reader. They are almost masterly in their scholarly compactness. But the sections on Satire, Letter-Writing, and History better preserve a golden mean between too much and too little.

Cyril Bailey, besides having prepared the sections on Didactic Poetry, Oratory, and Philosophy, has written a brief general Introduction (pages 1-13) in which he treats of the importance of litera-

ture to a better understanding of an ancient people, some qualities of Latin literature in general, and the several periods of development through which that literature passed. The editors have refrained from going beyond Apuleius for their material, a policy to which we might be reconciled were it not for the unqualified statement of Mr. Bailey that "the student who has followed it [Latin literature] up to Tacitus will have made the acquaintance of all that is worth knowing" (p. 13). Are we, then, to forsake the *Pervigilium Veneris* (shades of Walter Pater!) and the *Mosella* as being not worth our while? In fact, the omission of the former gem is, to my mind, one of the most serious blemishes of this book, chronological limits notwithstanding. I do not recall that it is even mentioned. The number of Latin authors represented by quotations totals fifty-four.

I have noted a number of errors of inadvertence or misstatement. On page 7 the Silver Age of Latin literature is said to end with Domitian, whereas on page 11 it is extended to the time of Hadrian, which seems to be more truly what the writer had in mind. On page 9 Catulus and Catullus have merged to produce a hybrid in the elegist "*Q. Valerius Catulus*," where *Q. Lutatius Catulus* was intended; he appears properly nominated later in the book (p. 130). Naevius did *not*, like Ennius, treat of the Second Punic War, but of the First (p. 60). The authorship of the charming translation of Catullus 3 ("Weep, weep, ye Loves and Cupids all") often, as here on page 64, mentioned as anonymous, is now to be assigned to G. S. Davies, on the authority of the 1921 edition of the *Oxford Book of Latin Verse*, page 454. While the matter of Ovid's banishment is, and perhaps always will be, *sub indice*,¹ it is hardly fitting to state categorically that the immediate cause of it was "the implication of Ovid in some court scandal" (p. 158). Who knows? On page 180 Asinius Pollio has become "Pollius." Livy's tenth book, to be sure, does end with the year 293 B.C., which, however, is not the same thing as "the end of the Second Samnite War" (p. 404), inasmuch as that war had closed at least ten years earlier and the Third, meanwhile, had started (in 298 B.C.). Gaius Gracchus died one year earlier than 120 B.C. (p. 443). At the very top of page 446 there is an awkward sentence which confuses for the reader the order in which Cicero and Verres held their respective quaestorship and praetorship in Sicily. There

¹ CLASSICAL JOURNAL, XXII (1927), 366.

are slight defects in printing in the notes on pages 214, 251, 314, 316 (where the word "what" seems to have been omitted), and 372.

But we must not be blinded by minutiae. *The Mind of Rome* is an excellent book. It covers a wide range of literature within its prescribed limits, delving into many corners which even the well-read classicist might commonly miss. Its orderly arrangement makes it uncommonly serviceable for those who would study types of Latin literature. Its selections are, in general, well merited and its translations carefully chosen, in most instances from the best renderings already available. Usually the Latin poets are represented by verse translations. The halftone illustrations have been well chosen and beautifully printed and help greatly in making a very attractive volume. Altogether the book is a highly desirable addition to our library of classical antiquity in English dress.

Miss Pym's volume, *Readings from the Literature of Ancient Rome*, is far less pretentious. It does not aim at completeness at all. On the other hand it offers us translated specimens of Latin literature down to St. Augustine, and it *does* contain a rendering of the *Pervigilium Veneris*, in a charming verse translation by R. Kennard Davis, hitherto unpublished. Altogether just sixteen authors are included, in the following order: Livy, Lucretius, Caesar, Catullus, Cicero, Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Tacitus, Statius, Pliny, the *Pervigilium Veneris*, Ausonius, Prudentius, Claudian, St. Augustine. The book is designed for younger readers. Accordingly many of the selections have been made with an eye to their human interest as much as to their literary worth, and the introductory and explanatory essays are commendably simple and sane. Most of the verse renderings have been chosen from a wide range of published translations. The prose translations, however, have been freshly made by Miss Pym and contain many a vigorous phrase and modern touch. Not least among the attractive features of the book are the timely bits of English verse which have been inserted here and there throughout its pages (e.g., pp. 17, 84, 93, 149, 230, 265, 304). The section on the *Pervigilium Veneris* is prefaced quite appropriately by three pages from Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*. The illustrations are excellent, though they might be more numerous. A sketch map of Italy and a brief list of books for further reading add not inconsiderably to the usefulness of the volume. Such a book as this might well be used by the younger students in our colleges as supplementary reading in a course in

Roman Civilization. It has obvious limitations; but at the same time it has much real worth and considerable charm.

It is regrettable that a number of careless errors have been permitted to stand uncorrected since the book's first printing (in 1922, by Harrap and Co., London). According to tradition, Rome was governed by kings not "for about a hundred and fifty years" (p. 27), but for a hundred years more; the Capitol is a hill on the *left*, not the "right," bank of the Tiber (p. 34); on pages 118 and 119 (top) Crassipes is Anglicized incorrectly as "Crassipedes," though he is properly named on pages 119 (middle) and 122; there is on page 146 a mistaken rendering of *De Senectute* 19.70, first sentence; the year of Vergil's birth was 70 B.C., not "50 B.C." (p. 150); Camillus saved Rome from the Gauls in 390 (or 387) B.C., not in "380 B.C." (p. 184); Fabius was *not* consul when "Hannibal invaded Italy in 218 B.C." (p. 186); Melpomene was the muse of Tragedy, not of Poetry (p. 212 and 227); the birthplace of Ovid was *not* the Sulmo "ninety miles south-east of Rome" (p. 229), but Sulmo among the Paeligni, seventy-five miles northeast of Rome. It is somewhat confusing to read on one page (71) that Cato the Elder died at the age of eighty-five (as Cicero tells us he did) and then on the next, without further comment, to find Livy quoted to the effect that "in his ninetieth year he brought Sulpicius Galba to trial before the people." The statement that "there were no novels written or published in ancient Rome" (p. 228) is scarcely true. Neither should Pliny be credited with having provided a "college" for his native town (p. 273); perhaps "high school" would be nearer the truth (see *Epp.* 4. 13). On page 59 the name of the consul should be Terentius, not "Tertius."

JOHN W. SPAETH, JR

BROWN UNIVERSITY

The Week: An Essay on the Origin and Development of the Seven-Day Cycle. By F. H. COLSON. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. Pp. viii+126. \$2.00.

It seems anomalous that, although the history of the calendar has been worked out in great detail, the study of the origin of the week has received comparatively little attention. The week is not a natural division of time, as are the day, the month, the year. The Greeks of classical times had no week. The Romans had the *nundinatio*, or

eight-day week. I suspect that the story of Creation as told in Genesis has caused even scholars to accept a seven-day week as a matter that requires no investigation. Those of us who have Friends among our intimate associates are constantly reminded (by "First Day," "Second Day," etc.) of the pagan character of the names of the days, the planetary origin of which is clearly shown in modern languages that have been deeply influenced by the Latin civilization.

There are two big problems in connection with the history of the week: How did it originate? How did it manage to supplant the *nundinatio*, or eight-day week, in the Roman Empire? With the first question our author is not greatly concerned. Its solution must await further research by Oriental scholars. His main purpose is "to shew how the double conception involved in the Jewish and the planetary week took root in the Roman Empire and produced the institution under which we live" (8).

I have seen several proposals to make our year consist of thirteen months, but in spite of many obvious benefits the movement makes little headway. What made the Roman Empire willing (or what forced it) to change from a week of eight days to one of seven? How did the two systems manage to establish a *modus vivendi* side by side for the first two centuries of our era? It is remarkable that so important an event has left so few traces. There are no official records of the change. It must be remembered, however, that both astrology and Christianity gained their greatest following among the lowly and the illiterate. To compare great things with small, the observance of the seven-day week seems to have received as little official notice as the observance of Emancipation Day among the Negroes of the South. Even the existence of this day is not a matter of general knowledge in the North.

Dio Cassius (xxxvii. 16) tells us that Pompey captured Jerusalem in 63 B.C. by taking advantage of the refusal of the Jews to fight on "Saturn's day." He says elsewhere (xlix. 22) that this same city was taken by Antony in 38 B.C. "on the day even then called the day of Saturn." It would be unsafe, however, to conclude that the other days of the week had planetary names at this early date.

Mr. Colson believes that the planetary week, which rests on "the idea that the whole of time is under the control of divine beings, each of whom rules in turn" (5), grew in the Roman Empire because in

some vague way people began to associate the planets with their welfare (81). A summary of the meager details of the growth of the planetary week is given in chapter iii (18-38). By the beginning of the third century it was an accomplished fact. A chapter on "The Jewish Week" (11-17) recapitulates references in classical writers to the Jewish Sabbath.

The final conclusion is "that we owe our religious and civil Sunday to the combination of these two factors, the immemorial familiarity of the Jewish Christian with the Sabbatical week and the recent familiarity of the Gentile Christian with the planetary week" (107).

I believe that the change from the *nundinatio* to the septenary week was not as difficult as might be supposed. Both the Roman and the Jewish calendars were religious in character. The *nundinae* seem to have been dedicated to Jupiter (Macrob. *Sat.* i. 16. 30), just as the Sabbath was to the Lord.

The *nundinae* and Sabbaths were hinge-days. Many acts of the week revolved about them. Two humorous illustrations of this for market-days may be given from the *Menippeae* of Varro (Buecheler's edition, Nos. 186 and 279):

Quotiens priscus homo ac rusticus Romanus inter nundinum barbam radebat?
Utri magis sunt pueri? Hi pusilline, qui expectant nundinas, ut magister
dimittat lussum. . .

Mr. Colson (16) cites the case of a certain grammarian of Rhodes named Diogenes, who lectured only on the seventh day. He explains this custom, with some diffidence, "on the supposition that there were so many people at leisure on the Sabbath that he found it a suitable day on which to collect an audience." There was a certain Marcus Antonius Gniphio, a grammarian of Rome, who declaimed only on market-days (Suet. *De Gram.* 7). His purpose is obvious. Politicians took similar advantage of the opportunities presented by these days (Macrob. *Sat.* i. 16. 35).

The book is well written and is worth while as a matter of general information. It justifies mention in this journal because so much of the evidence is found in Greek and Latin, especially Latin, and because the seven-day week must have had a struggle in order to displace the *nundinatio* in the Roman Empire.

There are comparatively few references in the volume. This is due in some measure to the fact that the author has tried — with

success — to make himself intelligible to those "outside the narrow circle of professional scholars." Of course a book of this size and character does not pretend to be exhaustive. It does, however, give us the outlines of the story in an admirable manner. Some of the conclusions are admittedly more or less theoretical. One of the purposes of the author is to stimulate further inquiry into the subject. If some aspiring doctor can succeed in tracing for us the decline of the *nundinatio* during the first two centuries of the Christian era, he will incidentally solve a few problems in connection with the history of the week in Europe. I hope, however, that a favorable reception of this book will stimulate Mr. Colson himself to further investigation.

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Return of the Theban Exiles. By A. O. PRICKARD. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1926.

This little volume offers in translation the story of the capture of the Cadmeia by the Theban exiles in 379-378 B.C., as told by Plutarch and Xenophon. The English version of Plutarch's *De Genio Socratis* is successful to an astonishing degree in spite of the fact that the text of this dialogue abounds in difficulties and lacks a commentary. The return of the exiles is described a second time by Plutarch in his *Life of Pelopidas*. The pertinent chapters are given in this book in the French translation of Jacques Amyot (1514-1593), sometime Bishop of Auxerre. Though the two accounts in Plutarch do not agree in all the details, they give us in general the Boeotian version of the incident. Xenophon tells the same story from a narrow, Lacedaemonian viewpoint in his *Hellenica* v. 4. 3 which is here translated into English. The final selection is a character sketch of Epaminondas, taken from Sir Walter Raleigh's *Historie of the World*. Sir Walter's praise of Epaminondas is unstinted. He writes: "So died Epaminondas, the worthiest man that ever was bred in that Nation of Greece, and hardly to bee matched in any Age or Countrey; for hee equalled all others in the severall vertues, which in each of them were singular."

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Recent Books

[Compiled by Joseph W. Hewitt, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.]

- Aesop. Fables.* Translated by SIR R. L'ESTRANGE. Edition limited to 325 numbered copies. London: Golden Cockerel Press, 1926. Pp 99. 17s. 6d.
- ALLEN, T. W. *Greek Abbreviations in the Fifteenth Century.* London: Oxford, 1926. 2s. 6d.
- Aristotle. *The Nichomachean Ethics*: with an English translation by H. RACKHAM. (Loeb Classical Library). New York: Putnam, 1926. Pp. 675. \$2.50.
- BORUCKI, J. *Seneca philosophus quam habeat auctoritatem in aliorum scriptorum locis afferendis.* Dissertation. Borna-Leipzig: Noske, 1926. Pp. 52.
- COLUM, PADRAIC. *The Golden Fleece and the Heroes Who Lived Before Achilles.* Illustrated by POGANY. School edition. New York: Macmillan. Pp. 298. \$1.80.
- DECLAREUIL, J. *Rome, the Lawgiver.* (History of Civilization). London: K. Paul, 1927. Pp. 416. 16s.
- Demosthenes. *On the Crown.* Translated by O. L. HOLLAND. Bournemouth: Mate, 1926. Pp. 102.
- Eclogae Grecolatinae.* Fasc. 28. L. Annaeus Seneca ad Marciam de consolatione, de providentia. Ausgewählt von P. BECKER. Leipzig-Berlin. Pp. 32. 80pf.
- EHRENBERG, V. *Alexander und Aegypten.* Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926. Pp. 59. M.2.
- ERRANDONEA, P. I. *Homero y la critica.* Madrid: Administración de Razón y Fe. Pp. 12.
- FIELD, W. T. *Rome, the Eternal City.* Two vols. in one. Illustrated. London: J. Hamilton, 1927. Pp. 308. 16s.
- FORRER, L. *Catalogue of the Weber Collection of Greek Coins.* Vol. III, Pt. 1. London: Spink, 1926. Text, pp. 477, with portfolio of 146 plates. 84s.

- FRÖDIN, OTTO. *Rapport Préliminaire sur les fouilles d'Asiné, 1922-24*. Lund: Gleerup, 1925. Pp. 73, with 48 figs.
- GARDNER, DELPHIS. *The Tale of Troy: retold in seven books*. Asphodel Press, 1925.
- GILLIES, W. K. and CUMMING, A. R., editors. *Latin of the Empire*. London: Blackie, 1927. Pp. 231. 4s. 6d.
- GULICK, C. B. *Modern Traits in Old Greek Life*. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome). New York: Longmans, 1926. Pp. 166. \$1.75.
- HENDERSON, B. W. *The Great War between Athens and Sparta*. 29 maps. New York: Macmillan.
- HERTER, H. *De dis Atticis Priapi similibus*. Dissertation. Bonn: Scheur. Pp. 63.
- HOFER, M. R. *Festival and Civic Plays from Greek and Roman Tales*. Chicago: Beckly-Cardy Co., 1926. Pp. 237. \$1.25.
- HOMO, LEON. *Primitive Italy and the Beginnings of Roman Imperialism*. (History of Civilization). London: Paul, 1927. Pp. 387. 16s.
- HULTON, E. *The Valley of Arno: a study of its geography, history, and works of art*. Boston: Houghton, 1926. Pp. 301. \$5.00.
- JONES, H. STUART, editor. *A Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome. The Sculptures of the Palazzo dei Conservatori*. By members of the British School at Rome. New York: Oxford. Text xxiv+408. 124 Plates. \$33.50.
- KAEGI, A. *A Short Grammar of Classical Greek with Tables of Repetition*. 14th edition. St. Louis: Herder, 1926. Pp. 268. \$1.25.
- H. KNORRINGA. *Emporos: data on trade and trader in Greek literature from Homer to Aristotle*. Dissertation. Amsterdam: Paris. Pp. 144. 2 Guld. 90.
- KUMMANIECKI, C. F. *Quo temporis ordine Vergilius singulos Aeneidos libros elaboraverit*. Cracoviae: Gebethner, 1926. Pp. 89.
- L. LEMARCHAND. *Dion de Pruse. Les oeuvres d'avant l'exil*. Paris: de Gigord, 1926. Pp. 181.
- Marc Aurèle. *A moi-même*. Vol. I. Traduction en Français par G. LOISEL. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires, 1926. Pp. xxxiv+328.
- MARCH, J. M. *The Architectural Orders of the Greeks and Romans*. New York: Architectural Book Publ. Co., 1926. Pp. 200. \$9.00.

- MENK, E. A. *The Position of the Possessive Pronoun in Cicero's Orations*. Dissertation. Grand Forks, N. D., 1925. Pp. 71.
- MOULTON, J. H. *An Introduction to the Study of New Testament Greek*. Fourth edition. London: Epworth, 1926. Pp. 348. 5s.
- MURRAY, REV. R. R. *The History of Political Science from Plato to the Present*. New York: Appleton, 1926. Pp. 442. \$4.00.
- OTTO, W. F. *Die altgriechische Idee*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Pp. 26. M.1.
- ORLEANS, S. and SOLOMON, M. *Latin Prognosis Test*. Yonkers and Chicago: World Book Company, 1926.
- PAIS, ETTORE. *Histoire Romaine*, Tome I.: *Les origines à l'achèvement de la conquête* (133 B.C.). Adapté par JEAN BAYET. Fasc. I. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires, 1926. Pp. xxiii+144.
- Plato. *Oeuvres complètes*. Tome XIII, 1 partie. *Lettres*. Texte ét. et trad. par J. SOUILLIÉ. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1926. Pp. cii+85.
- RICHARDSON, L. J. D. *Tà 'Ivδixά: being a Herodotean Account of the Indian Mutiny*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1926. Pp. 38. 2s. 6d.
- SACKUR, W. *Vitruv und die Poliorketiker: Vitruv und die Christliche Antike*. Berlin: Ernst, 1925. Pp. xii+191; figs. 171. M.15.
- SHEPPARD, J. T. *Aeschylus and Sophocles: their work and influence*. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome). New York: Longmans, 1926. Pp. 211. \$1.75.
- SYMONS, ARTHUR. *Cities of Italy*. New ed. New York: Dutton, 1926. Pp. 277. \$2.50.
- Tacitus. *Germania*. Ein Ausschnitt aus der Entdeckungsgeschichte der Germanenländer durch Griechen und Römer. Bearbeitet von DR. HANS PHILIPP. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1926. Pp. 159.
- Terence. *Plays*. Translated into parallel English metres, by WILLIAM RITCHIE. London: Bell, 1927. 21s.
- VAN BUREN, E. D. *Greek Fictile Revetments in the Archaic Period*. Murray. Pp. xx+208. 1926. 24s.
- VOGT, J. *Homo novus, ein Typus der römischen Republik*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926. Pp. 28. M.1.20.
- WHICHER, G. M. *Roman Pearls and Other Verses*. Amherst, Mass.: The Bookmart. Pp. 90. \$1.25.
- WOODBERRY, G. E. *Taormina*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1926. Pp. 65. \$1.00.